



University of Pennsylvania
ScholarlyCommons

Publicly Accessible Penn Dissertations

2018

Before Black Boys Are Criminalized?: Race, Boyhood, And School Discipline In Early Childhood

Calvin Rashaud Zimmermann

University of Pennsylvania, calvinz@sas.upenn.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.upenn.edu/edissertations>

 Part of the [African American Studies Commons](#), and the [Sociology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Zimmermann, Calvin Rashaud, "Before Black Boys Are Criminalized?: Race, Boyhood, And School Discipline In Early Childhood" (2018). *Publicly Accessible Penn Dissertations*. 3076.
<https://repository.upenn.edu/edissertations/3076>

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. <https://repository.upenn.edu/edissertations/3076>
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.

Before Black Boys Are Criminalized?: Race, Boyhood, And School Discipline In Early Childhood

Abstract

The image of the “criminal” black male is one that shapes the social experiences of black males in U.S. society. The racialized and gendered representation of black males as criminal, primarily through the depiction of the “thug,” functions to justify various forms of social marginalization including disproportionate school suspension, mass incarceration, and even death. Research and policy often describe the source of these problems as a product of black males’ culturally deviant behaviors, and thus, minimize the role of race and racism in producing these outcomes. Thus, social and educational discourse frequently depict black males as the source of their own problems, rather than that they face social problems that stem from racism, capitalism, and other structural factors. The racialized depiction of black males is often thought of as something that exclusively shapes the social lives of black male adolescents and adults. However, my dissertation undertakes the important task of understanding if and how this image might be evident even as early as early childhood. I do so through an examination of teacher perceptions and practices related to school discipline. My data come from two sources: the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study: Kindergarten Class of 2010, and two years of ethnographic observations following a group of students from kindergarten through first-grade within a diverse elementary school. The study finds that (1) teachers perceive that black boys exhibit more problem behaviors than their non-black peers, after controlling for student, teacher, and school characteristics, including past behavior; (2) teachers take racialized approaches to discipline with similar behaving black boys and white boys; and (3) in comparison to non-black boys who exhibit similar levels of problem behaviors, teachers are more likely to contact the parents of black boys about behavior problems. Although the prevailing literature portrays that black boys are free from the constraints of racism in early childhood, this dissertation suggests that anti-black racism does indeed shape the earliest school experiences of black boys. The findings of this dissertation speak to theories that suggest that schools play a socializing role in society. It appears that black boys’ earliest school experiences are socializing them into a society that depicts them as problems and treats them as such.

Degree Type

Dissertation

Degree Name

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

Graduate Group

Sociology

First Advisor

Tukufu Zuberi

Keywords

Black boys, Early childhood, Education, Intersectionality, Mixed methods, Racism

Subject Categories

African American Studies | Sociology

BEFORE BLACK BOYS ARE CRIMINALIZED?:
RACE, BOYHOOD, AND SCHOOL DISCIPLINE IN EARLY CHILDHOOD

Calvin Rashaud Zimmermann

A DISSERTATION

in

Sociology

Presented to the Faculties of the University of Pennsylvania in

Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

2018

Supervisor of Dissertation:

Tukufu Zuberi, Professor of Sociology

Graduate Group Chairperson:

Jason Schnittker, Professor of Sociology

Dissertation Committee:

Annette Lareau, Professor of Sociology

Howard Stevenson, Professor of Education

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Completing my goal of obtaining a PhD in Sociology would not have been possible without the support and guidance of many people.

I want to thank my brilliant wife, Roniqua, for her support through the late nights, editing, grading, brainstorming, and random discussions of my ideas. She has always been my number one fan and constantly reminds me of my greatness. I admire her compassion and commitment to social justice. To my daughter, Aziyah Sa'naa. Although she is only 9 months at the time I am writing this, she may see this one day. She changed my life from the moment I held her. She motivated me to accomplish things that I once thought were impossible. I know that she will do powerful things in the future. To my mother, Sandra, and my grandparents, Ollie and Louis, who made a way of no way on the west side of Chicago. I know it was not easy. And yes, you all can tell everyone to call me doctor now.

To my longtime mentor and friend, Dr. Derrick Williams. He introduced me to the life of the mind and what progressive black masculinities looks like. I am forever indebted to him. Like our idol Ella Baker, I hope to mentor the younger generation like he did for me and many others.

I would like to express gratitude to my dissertation committee: Dr. Tukufu Zuberi, Dr. Grace Kao, Dr. Annette Lareau, Dr. Howard Stevenson, and Dr. Krystal Strong. As the committee chair, Tukufu challenged me to think more deeply about my dissertation and how it connects to the larger picture. From impromptu Skype meetings

while he is out of the country to discussing the connection between Kendrick Lamar's "Fear" and my dissertation, I am grateful to have him as a mentor. From the beginning of my doctoral career, Grace took me under her wing as her student. Her words of advice, both professional and personal, will stick with me forever. Annette has also been a major source of professional and personal support for me throughout my entire time at the University of Pennsylvania. She always made time to meet with me, provide in-depth feedback on my work, and a bit of "free advice." I am especially thankful for the opportunity to participate in a writing group with her and other students. I took two classes with Howard that have deeply impacted me. He was someone that I had to have on my committee, both because of his area of expertise and his approach to scholarship. I will remember to always think "both/and," rather than "either/or." I met Krystal later on in the process but her impact on me is none the lesser. As junior faculty, she inspires me, I admire her intellectual rigor and the way she engages students in the classroom. I hope to one day challenge, support, and inspire students the way that my committee has done for me.

I would also like to thank my colleagues. Thank you to the members of my writing group: Nora, Rita, Sherelle, Yi-lin, Hyejeong, Aliya, Peter, and Tyler. I enjoyed reading all of your work and appreciate your feedback on my work. I wish nothing but the best for all of you. To my dear comrade, Sonita, she was a major reason I persisted and finished my PhD. We both struggled throughout this journey, but we lifted up one another. We pushed each other and reminded each other why we do what we do. I am proud to call her my friend. I am thankful to have met my good friend and colleague

Kayla. Always available for last minute feedback on my work. Her work ethic inspires me.

I'd like to thank the Sociology department staff, Audra, Aline, Marcus, and Katee for all of their help. I am particularly convinced that Audra can move mountains. Also, thanks to the staff and faculty in Africana Studies who I have worked with during the Summer Institute. The institute was an experience that I will never forget.

I am thankful for the educators who I spent so much time with during this study. Thank you to the many parents and activists who I spoke with during my research. I hope my work will contribute in some way, however small, to a better future for our children.

To the ancestors, both known and unknown, thank you for strength, persistence, and endurance. I know that I do not walk alone. Ubuntu.

ABSTRACT

BEFORE BLACK BOYS ARE CRIMINALIZED?:

RACE, BOYHOOD, AND SCHOOL DISCIPLINE IN EARLY CHILDHOOD

Calvin Rashaud Zimmermann

Tukufu Zuberi

The image of the “criminal” black male is one that shapes the social experiences of black males in U.S. society. The racialized and gendered representation of black males as criminal, primarily through the depiction of the “thug,” functions to justify various forms of social marginalization including disproportionate school suspension, mass incarceration, and even death. Research and policy often describe the source of these problems as a product of black males’ culturally deviant behaviors, and thus, minimize the role of race and racism in producing these outcomes. Thus, social and educational discourse frequently depict black males as the source of their own problems, rather than that they face social problems that stem from racism, capitalism, and other structural factors. The racialized depiction of black males is often thought of as something that exclusively shapes the social lives of black male adolescents and adults. However, my dissertation undertakes the important task of understanding if and how this image might be evident even as early as early childhood. I do so through an examination of teacher perceptions and practices related to school discipline. My data come from two sources: the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study: Kindergarten Class of

2010, and two years of ethnographic observations following a group of students from kindergarten through first-grade within a diverse elementary school. The study finds that (1) teachers perceive that black boys exhibit more problem behaviors than their non-black peers, after controlling for student, teacher, and school characteristics, including past behavior; (2) teachers take racialized approaches to discipline with similar behaving black boys and white boys; and (3) in comparison to non-black boys who exhibit similar levels of problem behaviors, teachers are more likely to contact the parents of black boys about behavior problems. Although the prevailing literature portrays that black boys are free from the constraints of racism in early childhood, this dissertation suggests that anti-black racism does indeed shape the earliest school experiences of black boys. The findings of this dissertation speak to theories that suggest that schools play a socializing role in society. It appears that black boys' earliest school experiences are socializing them into a society that depicts them as problems and treats them as such.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments.....	ii
Abstract.....	v
Chapter 1	
Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2	
Literature Review.....	22
Chapter 3	
Constructing Young Black Boys as Problems: Racial/Ethnic Disparities in Teachers’ Perceptions of Boys’ Problem Behaviors in First Grade.....	35
Chapter 4	
Boys will be Boys?: Everyday Interactions and the Racialization of School Discipline in Early Childhood.....	52
Chapter 5	
Too Much to Handle?: Racial/Ethnic Disparities in Teachers’ Contact with Young Boys’ Parents about Problem Behavior in First Grade.....	86
Chapter 6	
Discussion.....	97
<i>Tables</i>	105
<i>References</i>	114

CHAPTER 1:

INTRODUCTION

“Theoretically, the Negro needs neither segregated schools nor mixed schools. What he needs is Education.”

-W.E.B. Du Bois (1935: 335)

Scholars in the United States make two parallel arguments about early childhood and black boys: first, early childhood, although often perceived as an “innocent” period in the life course, is an important time when children learn and negotiate powerful racialized and gendered meanings (Bernstein 2011; Epstein, Blake, and González 2017; Ferguson 2001; Gilliam et al. 2016; Goff et al. 2014; Okonofua and Eberhardt 2015; Thorne 1993; Van Ausdale and Feagin 2001; Yates and Marcelo 2014). Secondly, dominant depictions of black masculinity often characterized black boys as “bad boys” who are less innocent than white boys (Collins 2005a; Ferguson 2001; Goff et al. 2014). The “bad boy” images shapes black boys interactions at school, especially disciplinary interactions (Ferguson 2001; Gilliam et al. 2016; Monroe 2005; Okonofua and Eberhardt 2015). However, scholars argue that this racialized depiction is not evident until around 10 years old or fourth grade (Ferguson 2001; Goff et al. 2014; Kunjufu 1995; Ladson-Billings 2011).

Thus, the connection between depictions of black masculinity and black boys' school experiences in early childhood remains underexplored. It is not clear how racialized and gendered meanings and practices may be unique at this stage in the life course. It may be that racial biases and discrimination that disadvantage black boys are evident prior to age 10 yet may be distinct from the ways in which they are evident after age 10. Recent experiments in psychology suggest that this might be the case (Gilliam et al. 2016; Okonofua and Eberhardt 2015). It is also possible that at such a young age, black boys may be protected from the ills of race and racism. While studies often suggest that adults criminalize black males beginning in adolescence, what happens before this period continues to be neglected. The purpose of my dissertation is to address this limitation of the prevailing literature on black masculinity and schooling by investigating if and how teachers' perceptions and interactions with black boys in early childhood, as they relate to school discipline, are racialized. Building upon previous work in psychology that uses controlled experiments, I take a sociological and naturalistic approach to these questions.

My mixed-methods dissertation examines three social relationships important for understanding race, gender, and school discipline in early childhood: (1) teachers' perceptions of problem behavior and student-teacher conflict, (2) student-teacher disciplinary interactions, and (3) teacher communication with parents about behavior problems. While the dissertation focuses on black boys, I use white boys as a reference group in order to gauge potential disparities. Chapter 2 provides a review of the research literature that serves as a basis for the empirical chapters of the dissertation. In

Chapter 3, I explore disparities in teacher reports of young boys' problem behaviors and student-teacher conflict in kindergarten. Chapter 4 uses ethnographic data to investigate racial differences teachers' disciplinary styles. In Chapter 5, I examine racial disparities in teacher communication with parents about behavior problems. It is important to note that the three empirical chapters of the dissertation are at different stages of development. Chapter 3 is the most developed and is a published paper. Chapter 4 received a "revise and resubmit" from a journal that specializes in the sociology of race. Chapter 5 is a more preliminary and underdeveloped paper that will be submitted to a journal that considers topics in the sociology of family. I conclude my dissertation in Chapter 6 by revisiting the findings in the three empirical chapters as well as discussing the theoretical contributions of my dissertation to both the sociology of education, and the sociology of race and racism. I also make suggestions for future research that address some of the limitations of this study.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

Schooling and Society

Many Americans see education in individualistic terms and view it as a tool for individual social mobility. In the popular imagination, schools serve as the "great equalizer" in American society. That is, if one does well in school, one will be successful. Schools are seen as egalitarian institutions that reward abilities, effort, and merit. This is related more broadly to the idea of the "American dream" in that hard work is the key to upward mobility. Thus, given this view, if one does not achieve the American dream it

is because of a lack of effort or ability. In short, one's social position in society is believed to be predicated on one's own efforts.

There are various sociological perspectives on the role of schools in society that view education in more collective terms. The two perspectives I use in this dissertation include social reproduction theory and African-centered theories of education. Both acknowledge the sociopolitical context of schooling. Social reproduction theories argue that schools serve to reproduce existing class inequalities in society (Bourdieu and Passeron 1990; Bowles and Gintis 2011; Willis 1981). Also, conflict theorists argue that educational inequalities, and inequality more broadly, are not simply based on effort and ability, and that schools largely serve to reproduce inequalities in society. However, as conflict theory is heavily influenced by the work of Marx, this research obscures the fundamental role of race and racism in understanding educational inequalities in the United States. I draw upon several African-centered scholars who provide a more comprehensive theorization on the relationship between schools and society. African-centered theories argue that schools serve to reproduce the system of white racial domination (i.e., white supremacy) and capitalism (Givens 2016; Watkins, Ayers, and Quinn 2001; Welsing 1991; Wilson 1992, 1978; Woodson 1933). I use these theories to provide a framework for understanding how young black boys' early school experiences are related to the larger sociopolitical context of anti-blackness and white supremacy.

Schools versus Schooling

First, it is important to delineate between schools and schooling (Bidwell and Kasarda 1980). Schools refers to an organization that conducts instruction while schooling refers to social processes or what happens in schools (Bidwell and Kasarda 1980). This delineation is important because it allows one to more accurately identify and explain the role of schools in society. In other words, there are ways in which schools' organizational components relate to society more broadly but there are also ways in which the experiences of students in schools relate to society more broadly. Secondly, to clarify this relationship, it is also important delineate what we mean by society. Typically, when sociologists describe "society" they are referring to the way groups of people relate to one another in an organized and patterned way (i.e., social relationships). Thus, the question becomes, what is the role of school as an organization and schooling as a social process in maintaining, creating, or disrupting social patterns and social relationships? More specifically, how does black boys' schooling relate to society?

Schools as Socializing Institutions: Social Reproduction and African-Centered Theories of Education

Student socialization plays an important role in social reproduction theories of education (Anyon 1980; Bowles and Gintis 2011; Giroux and Penna 1979). Supporters of social reproduction theories would agree with functionalists that schools socialize and allocate students to specific social positions in society but they would critique one of the functionalist perspectives main assumptions. This assumption is that schools play a

meritocratic role of society. Most functionalists argued that social stratification is based on ability and skills, or genetics (Herrnstein 1973; Herrnstein and Murray 1996), rather than ascriptive characteristics such as social class. Conversely, conflict theorists argue that schools primary role is the reproduction and maintenance of social inequalities and stratification (Alexander, Entwisle, and Olson 2014; Bourdieu and Passeron 1990; Bowles and Gintis 2011; Collins 1971; Jencks 1972; MacLeod 2008; Willis 1981). Many empirical works demonstrate the strong relationship between students' social class origins and their educational and occupational destinations (Alexander et al. 2014; Blau and Duncan 1967; MacLeod 2008; Sewell, Haller, and Portes 1969; Willis 1981). This strong relationship is not simply due to differences in cognitive skills and abilities (Bowles and Gintis 2011; Farkas 2003).

In their seminal work, Bowles and Gintis (2011) argue that schools serve to reproduce economic inequality in a capitalistic system. They show empirically that cognitive abilities and skills do not explain much of the variation in economic inequality. Rather they argue that economic inequality is a structural aspect of capitalism. In other words, inequality is a necessary part of a capitalist economic system. Thus, they shift the explanation from individual motivation and aptitude to the very economic system of U.S. society. Bowles and Gintis (2011) state that it is not that individuals differ in their abilities and that this explains social stratification. Instead, they argue that the maintenance of capitalistic economic system depends on maintaining social stratification. According to the authors, one of the key social institutions that this occurs through is the U.S. educational system via socialization. They argue that schools prepare

students for their adult worker roles through behavioral expectations. They show how there are differential behavioral expectations for those who are expected to obtain low-skill jobs versus those who are expected to obtain high-skill jobs. Socialization in schools mirror what is expected in the stratified workplace.

Some scholars accuse Bowles and Gintis of making a functionalist argument in *Schooling in Capitalist America* in that functionalists argue that the benefits of some social arrangement, in this case educational stratification, explain why the arrangement exist (Bowles and Gintis 2003). At face value this critique appears fair as Bowles and Gintis (2011) do explain who benefits from educational stratification. However, they argue that functionalist arguments do not specify a causal mechanism while their argument did in fact specify a causal mechanism (Bowles and Gintis 2003). The concept of the “correspondence principle” is their causal mechanism which states that schools reproduce stratification by preparing students for their worker role within the capitalist system (Bowles and Gintis 2003, 2011).

While social reproduction theories provide some insight for understanding the relationship between schools and society, they neglect to consider how race profoundly shapes the relationship between schools and society in the United States. African-centered scholars (Du Bois 1935; Hilliard 1992; Kunjufu 1995; Rabaka 2003, 2013; Welsing 1991; Williams 2004; Wilson 1992, 1978; Woodson 1933) have long theorized about the relationship between systems of racism, capitalism, and schooling. These theorists suggest that one of the major functions of schooling in the United States is to maintain white racial domination and black subjugation. Thus, similar to conflict

theorists, they argue that schools serve to reproduce both racial and class stratification. African-centered scholars focus on the unique oppression that black children and youth face in schools and society. They also consider what the future of black education must look like in order to reach a more liberatory future for black people.

Like social reproduction theory, the role of socialization is also critical for understanding how schools maintain black subjection. African-centered theorists argue that the purpose and function of schools is to socialize black students into a sense of inferiority and control (Welsing 1991; Wilson 1992). As Wilson (1992) argues, in order to understand the socialization of black students in schools, one must question what kind of character is necessary in black children and youth to maintain the system of white supremacy and racial capitalism. In contrast, to reach black liberation from oppression we must also ask what kind of character is necessary. These two frameworks are conflicting. As the current educational system's purpose is to maintain white supremacy and racial capitalism, it is necessary that schools frame black students as academic and behavioral problems themselves. This takes the blame away from oppressive conditions in schools and instead frames the problems black youth face in schools as due their own deficiencies (Dumas 2014, 2016b). However, an educational system for black liberation must be inherently revolutionary, seeking to radically change the way we educate and the very definition of education (Wilson 1992).

Wilson (1992) notes that one of the key ways that the current educational system miseducates black children and youth is through the control of definitions. That is, the system defines what is a "standard" education, what is appropriate behavior, or

what constitutes normal academic performance. There is a certain power embedded in controlling definitions and norms that are typically taken-for-granted. However, this system is oppressive because these standards do not take into account the unique history and experience of black people in the United States. Instead, the education of black children is based on a Eurocentric model of education, ignoring the unique history, needs, and future of black children. A truly liberatory education would take into account these issues, ensuring the survival and advancing the interests of black people in particular. In contrast, the current system seeks to maintain the status quo of black subordination.

How the current educational system defines problem behavior and school discipline are most relevant to this dissertation. Implicit in any teacher's rating of a child's problem behavior is a reference to appropriate or "normal" behavior. Yet there is no true appropriate behavior in any objective sense. Rather, the parameters of appropriate behavior as compared to problem behavior are set by the educational system and school organizations. These rules are often taken-for-granted and seen as some objective truth. However, in reality they are social constructs like all things in society. Further, as Wilson (1992) notes, if we consider the sociopolitical context of black children's problem behavior in school, two things emerge: first, we can see that in order for black children to be controlled in schools and society they must be perceived as having problems with self-control, which is one example of problem behavior, and, second, we often believe that these problems stem from black children themselves instead of a result of an oppressive and constraining school environment.

It should be expected that in such a school system that many black children will resist oppression through various forms of defiance. Although likely unconscious, this resistance is a political act in response to oppression. Other scholars have made similar claims about the need for black youth's defiance in schools (Wun 2015). Defiance is a necessary part of achieving the social change needed in schools and society. However, such defiance is frequently defined as a deficiency of black children (e.g., oppositional defiant disorder) and a justification of discipline and punishment. School discipline practices and policies, responding to such defiance or problem behavior, limits black children's potential through how the enforcement of school rules are racialized and how discipline attempts mold black children into docility and obedience. This style of disciplinary power in schools is antithetical to the need for a revolutionary and liberatory education for black children that would require defiance and disobedience.

Black Masculinity, Antiblackness, and Society

The other theoretical literature from which I draw comes from scholars that theorize the relationship between black masculinity, antiblackness, and society. In the United States, the dominant depiction of black masculinity is one of danger and criminality (Collins 2005a; Ferber 2007; Ferguson 2001). Black males are often perceived as a "problem" in need of control. These perceptions do not just shape the lives of black men as black boys also navigate these labels in their everyday lives. The depiction of black masculinity as deviant often serves to dehumanize black boys and men while justifying various forms of social exclusion, including death. Collins (2006), theorizing the

relationship between black masculinity and white racial domination, argues that the idea of “white racial normality” and “black racial deviancy” depends on a gendered logic of racial difference (Collins 2006). Black boys and men come to be seen as particularly dangerous because of historical racist stereotypes and depictions of black masculinity (e.g., the “superpredator”) as uncontrollable, threatening, and hypersexual in the United States (Collins 2005a; Ferber 2007).

Scholars use the concepts of antiblack racism or antiblackness to define the global system of racism that uniquely affects the quality of life of human beings who are racially categorized as black (Bashi 2004; Dumas 2016a; Gordon 1995; Sexton 2008; Vargas 2012; Wun 2014). Theories of antiblackness argue that black people live in a world that regularly negates their humanity and freedom (Gordon 1995). Black people who express freedom are deemed threatening to society, thus in need of neutralization by denying their freedom (Gordon 1995). Drawing upon Hartman’s (2007) work, some scholars argue that the “afterlife of slavery” describes the contemporary moment of antiblackness in the U.S. The afterlife of slavery is characterized by the continued subjugation of black people after emancipation and during a period of supposed post-raciality and colorblindness (Bonilla-Silva 2013; Hartman 2007). As a function of antiblack racism, black people continue to endure “skewed life chances” and multiple forms of violence in the afterlife of slavery (Hartman 2007). In antiblack contexts, human beings racially categorized as black have been and continue to be exploited, scorned, and neglected in service of white racial domination (Bonilla-Silva 2013; Hill 2016; Pierre 2012; Winant 2002; Zuberi 2001). The disdain and disregard for blackness

justify various forms of racial stratification and violence against black bodies (Dumas 2016a). Antiracism suggests that black people are “problems” to society, rather than human beings that face social problems due to living in an antiracist society (Du Bois 1898; Gordon 1995).

I draw upon theories of black masculinity and antiracism in two ways. First, I utilize the concept of antiracism to define the social context in which black boys live. Antiracism seeps into social institutions, policies, norms, and practices. Nevertheless, anti-black racism affects the lives of black children in gendered ways (Collins 2005a). Accordingly, I also use theories of black boyhood/masculinity to emphasize how experiences and performances of black childhood differ by gender identity. Performances of black boyhood/masculinity interact with the social context of antiracism as black boys resist, internalize, and/or navigate antiracist contexts. Some scholars explore how ideas about black male criminality affect how others perceive black boys and men, whereas other scholars investigate how this ideology shape performances of black masculinity (Collins 2006; Ferguson 2001; Majors and Billson 1993). I employ theories of social reproduction, African-centered theories of education, and intersectional theories of black masculinity as a framework to analyze teachers’ perceptions and disciplinary interactions with black boys.

BACKGROUND

Blackness in the United States

Before delving into the literature on black boyhood and schooling in the United States it is necessary to provide a definition of blackness in the United States. I do not attempt to provide a comprehensive review of the origins of race in the United States or globally. Instead, my goal is to briefly clarify how I am defining blackness in my work. In short, to be black means to be racially classified as black and/or identify with such classification (Zuberi 2001). Racial classification is a relatively recent way of thinking about human difference (Zuberi 2001). It emerged from European imperialism as European powers divided human beings into distinct races to justify and facilitate colonization, enslavement, genocide, and other forms of exploitation of people categorized as “non-white” (Winant 2002; Zuberi 2001). This justification came through the social meanings attached to race and blackness in particular. In essence, racial classification and its attached social meanings was a sociopolitical project that justified and maintained white racial domination (Winant 2002; Zuberi 2001). Racial classification also became a source of identification and mobilization in the fight against white racial domination globally (Omi and Winant 2014; Winant 2002; Zuberi, Sibanda, and Udjo 2005). Given the differences in racial classification across the world, the commonality in what it means to be black is not the color of one’s skin or other physical characteristics, but rather in the similar historical experience of disdain for, and systemic subjugation of, those racially classified as black (Pierre 2012). As Pierre writes, “racialization processes in postcolonial Africa are such that they render analogous the experiences and relationships of continental Africans and those of African descent in the diaspora” (Pierre 2012: 1). I employ this particular conceptualization of blackness in my

dissertation to understand how racial meanings shape black boys' early school experiences.

Black Boyhood and Schooling

The United States is a nation currently affected by legacies of settler colonialism, enslavement, the eradication of slavery, legal segregation, and social movements that overturned legal forms of racism. With the dismantling of Jim Crow in the U.S., the dominant racial ideology currently suggests that the nation has entered a post-racial or colorblind period, especially after the election of its first black president Barack Obama (Bonilla-Silva 2013; Omi and Winant 2014; Winant 2002). However, scholars argue that racism continues to have a significant influence on the quality of life of human beings (Bonilla-Silva 2013; Carter 2012; Winant 2002).

One social institution in which racial inequalities continue to endure is education. Scholars in the United States find that educators often view black boys through a criminal lens justifying racialized discipline and punishment (Dumas and Nelson 2016; Ferguson 2001; Monroe 2005; Rios 2011). Hence, black boys navigate an educational system that frequently views and treats them as a problem. Research suggests that it is around the age of 10 when black boys begin to be criminalized, seen and treated as older than they are in schools (Ferguson 2001; Goff et al. 2014; Kunjufu 1995; Ladson-Billings 2011). Ferguson (2001) develops the idea of "adultification" in her study to theorize the relationship between black masculinity and schooling. She argues that, in contrast to white boys, black boys are often seen as older, less innocent,

more responsible for their behaviors, and, thus, rightfully subject to punitive treatment (Ferguson 2001). From her study one can understand how antiblack racial meanings, in the form of labeling, shapes adults' views of black boys and also black boys' sense of self, as she shows how they sometimes identify with these labels (Ferguson 2001).

DATA AND METHODS

My dissertation is a mixed-methods study of how racial and gendered meanings shape teacher perceptions and interactions with black boys in early childhood. I use the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study: Kindergarten Class of 2010-2011 (ECLS-K: 2010-11) for the two quantitative chapters. The first of which focuses on teacher perceptions of boys' problem behavior and student-teacher conflict. The second is an investigation of racial/ethnic disparities in teacher contact with the parents of boys about behavior problems, academic problems, and accomplishments. The qualitative chapter uses data on student-teacher disciplinary interactions from an ethnography I conducted in a public charter school following a group of kindergarteners through first grade.

Quantitative Chapters

Participants

This paper uses the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Kindergarten Class of 2010-2011 (ECLS-K: 2011). The ECLS-K: 2011 is a nationally representative sample of children surveyed from the beginning of kindergarten through the end of fifth grade. The sampling frame is a three-stage design: U.S. counties, then schools within counties,

and finally students within 968 schools. The scope of the data includes children's social, emotional, cognitive, and physical development. Also, the survey contains questions on children's home environment, home educational activities, school environment, classroom environment, classroom curriculum, teacher qualifications, and before and after-school care.

Study Sample

In this paper, I use two waves of data respectively collected in the Fall of 2010 and the Spring of 2011. The total analytic sample consists of around 14,900 students who have valid data on teachers' perceptions of children's problem behaviors and student-teacher conflict. The analyses focus on Asian, Black, Latino, and White kindergarteners. In order to measure the intersection of student race/ethnicity and gender, I construct a categorical variable that accounts for student race/ethnicity and gender based on parental reports. I create a series of dummy variables for each group (i.e., White girls, Black boys, Black girls, Latino boys, Latino girls, Asian boys, and Asian girls) and designate White boys as the reference group. Table 1 presents means, standard deviations, and descriptions for all variables used in the analyses.

Dependent Variables

Problem Behaviors. In order to examine teachers' subjective ratings of student problem behaviors, I use one measure of student behavior in the Spring of 2011: externalizing problem behaviors. The externalizing problem behaviors variable measures teacher perceptions of how often students "got angry, acted impulsively, argued, fought, and disturbed classroom activities." Each child's score is computed using the

average rating across the five items in the scale. Each item ranges from a 1-4 (1 = Never exhibits this behavior; 4 = Very often/exhibits behavior most of the time).

Student-Teacher Conflict. The second outcome variable is teacher ratings of student-teacher conflict in the Spring of 2011. Each child's score is computed using the average score across the eight-item subscale of the Student-Teacher Relationship Scale (Pianta 2001). The conflict scale measures teacher perceptions of the negative aspects of their relationship with the student. The scale ranges from 1-5 (1 = Definitely does not apply; 5=Definitely applies). Higher scores on the conflict scale indicate that a teacher feels he or she has a more conflictual relationship with the student. For example, one item on the 8-item asks the teacher to rate how much the following statement applies to their relationship with the child: "Dealing with this child drains my energy."

Control Variables

My analyses control for student, school, and teacher characteristics that may affect the association between student race/ethnicity and gender and teacher ratings of student problem behaviors and student-teacher conflict. All control variables are from the fall of 2010. I account for student characteristics by controlling for socioeconomic status (SES), family structure, age, grade retention, and test scores. Student socioeconomic status is a standardized composite of parental education, occupation, and income. Family structure is a categorical variable that compares students with one biological/adoptive parent, one biological/adoptive parent and one other, and other guardians to two biological/adoptive parents. These variables, particularly SES, are highly associated with student behaviors in the classroom, as shown in literature (Qi and

Kaiser 2003). Research also suggests that child's age, whether the child is repeating kindergarten, and students' academic ability may affect teachers' perceptions of students' behavior. In order to account for differences in school environment, I control for school characteristics that may affect teachers' perceptions of children's behaviors and student-teacher conflict. School characteristics include the percent of non-White students in the school, the percent of students that receive free lunch (i.e., the socioeconomic makeup of the school), whether the school is a public or private school, school region, and school locale. My analyses take into account teacher characteristics by controlling for teacher's race, education level, and years of experience. Also, because more than 95 percent of kindergarten teachers in the sample are women, I do not control for teachers' gender in the analyses. Lastly, teachers' perceptions of child's past behavior are likely to strongly influence teachers' current ratings of the students' behavior and student-teacher conflict. Studies find that teachers' perceptions of students' problem behaviors are among the strongest predictors of student-teacher conflict (Buyse et al. 2008; Hamre et al. 2008; Murray and Murray 2004). Therefore, I include a control variable for teacher ratings of children's problem behaviors in the Fall of 2010. Also, I include this variable in the final model because it allows me to gauge whether differences in teachers' ratings of children's past behavior explain differences in current ratings. We might expect that controlling for teachers' ratings of past behavior will mediate race and gender disparities in teachers' current ratings. If past behavior mediates differences in teachers' current ratings of behaviors for some subgroups and not for others, this may be evidence of bias.

Qualitative Chapter

My ethnographic research took place at World Charter School, a public charter school located in the downtown area of a large city in the United States. The school is both racially/ethnically and socioeconomically diverse. Black students make up the largest proportion of students at 40% of the student population, followed by white students at 25%, Latino students of any race at 20%, Asian students at 5%, and 10% of the student body is Multi-Racial. Fifty percent of the students are eligible for free or reduced lunch. Thus, similar to the school sites of other recent studies (Lewis, Diamond, and Forman 2015; Lewis-McCoy 2014), the school is relatively racially integrated in comparison to most schools in the city. This integration provides a unique opportunity to study everyday race relations.

Between October 2015 and June 2017, I visited the school three times per week for four hours per visit to conduct fieldwork. This paper uses data on 30 boys, 13 Black and 17 white, and their interactions with their teachers. These observations took place across school activities such as in the classroom, in the lunchroom, on the playground, and during fieldtrips. After each visit to the school, I recorded my observations as field notes. I also supplemented my observations with interviews with teachers and administrators.

Throughout the study I took the role of a participant observer. While in the classroom I helped with class activities, and interacted with students and teachers. I am an African American man, in my twenties at the time of this research. I used my status

and presence in the school as data in itself. While it was impossible to be seen as an insider by the children, I avoided being seen as authoritarian by children by avoiding any disciplinary actions. Rather, I sought to interact with the children in a way that they might see me as an older sibling. Like previous studies mention (Van Ausdale and Feagin 2001), in this role many children often wanted my attention such as talking to them, sitting next to them, reading with them, or playing with them on the playground. However, by doing so, I also had to balance the expectations of the teacher. Teachers expect children to obey the rules of the classroom and sometimes elicited my help with enforcing the rules. In the beginning of the study, I found this to be the case and made it clear to the teachers that I would not discipline students or intervene in any situations where students were breaking the rules, unless serious harm was evident. I explained to them that as a researcher I was primarily interested in children's behaviors and interactions with teachers, and that being seen as a disciplinarian would interfere with the goals of the study. The teachers understood and would relegate me to the role of a "helper" in the classroom.

Additionally, when interacting with the children, they sometimes came to me expecting me to intervene in interactions with their peers (e.g., "tattling"). In these difficult scenarios, I referred the child or children to the teacher. Also, another theme from my observations related to my role in the field was children looking at me when they broke the rules. These situations were much easier to handle than the previous scenarios, as I would look away and not engage in any disciplinarian gesture or action. For the most part, eventually it seemed that children did not worry about their

behaviors around me. Further, after the first few weeks of the study I saw fewer requests for disciplinarian interventions from both teachers and students.

My field notes produced hundreds of pages of data, of which I manually coded for analytic themes. Following the grounded theory tradition, I first began my analysis by “open coding” (Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw 2011; Glaser and Strauss 2000). I also wrote monthly “code memos” to gauge what stood out to me in the field, connecting it to the relevant theoretical and empirical literatures (Emerson et al. 2011). Once I began to narrow my interests to school disciplinary practices, I identified broad analytic themes related to my research questions such as child misbehavior, “watching,” reprimand, and punishment. As I continued doing fieldwork and writing code memos, I began to further specify these broad analytic themes. Reoccurring themes from more “focused coding” (Emerson et al. 2011) included surveillance by containment, discourse about surveillance, yelling, negotiation, “singled-out,” ignored, use of force, student reaction, and type of punishment.

CHAPTER 2:

LITERATURE REVIEW

Sociology of Race and Education

Hundreds of research articles and books detail various racial/ethnic inequalities in education. Scholars consistently find that race profoundly shapes everyday interactions and practices in schools and, thus, school outcomes.(Diamond 2006; Kao and Thompson 2003; Lewis 2003; Lewis and Diamond 2015; Lewis-McCoy 2014; Morris and Perry 2016; Pollock 2009; Turney and Kao 2009; Tyson 2003, 2011). This section of the dissertation does not attend to be a review of the entire empirical literature in the areas of sociology of race and education. Yet I do wish to summarize the consistent theoretical argument of this literature. In short, scholars argue that racial ideologies and racialized practices work together to create racial inequalities in education. The racial differences that we see in educational experiences and outcomes are the result of the advantages and disadvantages of race and racism. That is, ideas about race shape student experiences and interactions in schools such as their teacher expectations and student-teacher interactions. Examples include racial disparities in academic achievement, tracking, and school discipline (Lewis and Diamond 2015; Morris 2005; Morris and Perry 2017; Richards 2017; Tyson 2011, 2003).

Lewis and Diamond (2015) summarize the sociology of race and education by arguing that racial inequalities in education emerge because of a combination of: (1) structural inequalities, (2) institutional practices, and (3) racial ideologies (Lewis and

Diamond 2015). Although many people view schools as meritocratic and colorblind, which suggests that racial inequalities result from personal failures, research demonstrates that racial problems in education stem from social and structural issues. These issues often create advantages for white students and disadvantages for students of color.

Intersectionality in Education

As noted above, the relationship between race and education is heavily documented. In the case of the potential biases of teachers, many scholars discuss the relationship between student race and teacher perceptions (Downey and Pribesh 2004; Faulkner et al. 2014; McGrady and Reynolds 2013; Yates and Marcelo 2014), or student gender and teacher perceptions (Buchmann, DiPrete, and McDaniel 2008; DiPrete and Jennings 2012; Saft and Pianta 2001). However, by focusing on student race or gender, these studies neglect to engage with social theorists that stress the importance of the intersection of race and gender for understanding various social inequalities (Collins 2000; Crenshaw 1991). Intersectional theories add nuance to studies of racial or gender differences in teachers' perceptions of children's behaviors because often ignored are potential differences within gender categories by race/ethnicity and differences within racial/ethnic groups by gender. This is particularly relevant as research suggests that Black boys are especially viewed as problematic and less childlike than White boys (Ferguson 2001; Goff et al. 2014).

A few studies have examined how teachers' perceptions of children and youth are simultaneously gendered and racialized (Francis 2012; Riegler-Crumb 2006; Riegler-Crumb and Humphries 2012). For example, Riegler-Crumb and Humphries (2012) found evidence of teacher bias against White females as compared to White males in math teachers' perceptions of student ability. Interestingly, they found that differences in student achievement explained disparities in teachers' perceptions of math ability between White males and students of color of both traditional gender categories. Other intersectional research has focused on the unique schooling experiences of Black youth. For example, scholars argue that adults often wrongly view Black boys as less innocent and older than White boys (A. Ferguson, 2001; Goff, Jackson, Di Leone, Culotta, & DiTomasso, 2014). Scholars also show how Black girls' everyday behaviors are perceived as "unladylike" (Lei 2003; Morris 2007) and that they are frequently criminalized in schools (Morris 2016; Wun 2014, 2015). Qualitative studies examining adults' views and treatment of Black boys (A. Ferguson, 2001) and Black girls (E. Morris, 2007) are filtered through the "controlling images" (Collins 2005a) of Black masculinity and femininity. The controlling images of Black masculinity and femininity refer to the harmful depictions of Black boys and men as hypermasculine in comparison to White boys and men, and Black girls and women as masculine or "too strong" in comparison to White girls and women (Collins 2005a, 2006). These examples highlight the fact that students' school experiences are not just racialized or gendered independently, but both racialized and gendered simultaneously. Thus, in addition to the literature on gender or racial

disparities in teachers' perceptions, theories of intersectionality suggest that we should examine how teachers' perceptions are simultaneously racialized and gendered.

Race, Boyhood, and School Discipline

Theorists of intersectionality suggest that social identities and systems of race and gender do not independently affect the life chances of individuals (Collins 2005a; Crenshaw 1991). Instead, these theorists argue that race and gender simultaneously affect individuals' lives (Collins 2005a; Crenshaw 1991). "Controlling images" or depictions of various social groups shapes how people perceive and interact with these groups, and social policies targeted towards these groups (Brown and Donnor 2011; Collins 2005a). In the United States, the dominant depiction of Black masculinity is one of danger and criminality (Collins 2005a; Ferber 2007; Ferguson 2001). Black males are often depicted as a "problem" in need of discipline and social control in society (Dumas 2016b; Ferguson 2001). Both historically and contemporarily social and educational policies targeted towards Black males focus on fixing their "deviant" behaviors, which are cited as the source of the social problems (e.g., school discipline disparities, mass incarceration) they face, while the role of racism is minimized (Brown and Donnor 2011; Dumas 2016b).

However, these perceptions do not just shape the lives of Black men. Black boys also navigate similar labels in their everyday lives (Ferguson 2001; Goff et al. 2014; Ladson-Billings 2011). The depiction of Black boyhood/masculinity as deviant often serves to dehumanize Black boys while justifying various forms of social exclusion,

including death such as the tragic murder of 12-year-old Tamir Rice. Collins (2006), theorizing the relationship between Black masculinity and white supremacy, argues that the idea of “white racial normality” and “Black racial deviancy” depends on a gendered logic of racial difference (Collins 2006). Black boys come to be seen as particularly dangerous because of historical and contemporary racist stereotypes and depictions of Black boyhood/masculinity (e.g., the “thug”) as uncontrollable, threatening, and hypersexual in the United States (Collins 2005a; Ferber 2007). How these racial meanings, labels, or stereotypes become applied to individuals’ everyday interactions is termed racialization (Omi and Winant 2014). Racialization moves us away from understanding race as simply phenotype or individual characteristics, towards understanding the social processes of race and racism. Critical race scholars emphasize that racism is a social process facilitated through racial ideologies (e.g., as the “bad boy” depiction of Black boys) and structures (e.g., racialized discipline and punishment in schools) (Bonilla-Silva 2015; Feagin 2014; Golash-Boza 2016). Further, race is a “political commodity” used to reproduce racial domination and white supremacy, advantaging those racially categorized as white and disadvantaging people of color (Byng 2013). Using an intersectional perspective requires us to understand race and racism as also gendered. Collins (2005) theorizes how anti-Black racism uniquely affects the lives of Black women and men, or girls and boys (Collins 2005a). These simultaneously gendered and racialized processes are apparent in research on Black boys (Ferguson 2001; Morris 2005) and Black girls (Morris 2016; Wun 2015) experiences with school discipline.

There is an abundance of quantitative data that describe the racial and gendered patterns in school discipline in the United States. From these official statistics, we find Black children and youth are disproportionately suspended and expelled. Black children and youth make up 16% of the student population, yet they represent 32% of students who received an in-school suspension, 33% of students who received an out of school suspension once, 42% of students who received multiple out-of-school suspensions, and 34% of students who were expelled (U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights 2014). In terms of students who received an out-of-school suspension, and among boys, 20% of Black boys were suspended, compared to 6% of white boys, 9% of Latino boys of any race, and 3% of Asian boys. Thus, these patterns suggest that formal discipline characterizes the everyday experiences of Black boys much more than non-Black boys. While this data represents the entire student population from (K-12), official statistics also demonstrate that a similar pattern is evident in early childhood. Black preschoolers are suspended at alarmingly disproportionate rates. Black children makeup 18% of the preschool population, but comprise 42% of students who received a single out-of-school suspension and 48% of students who received multiple out-of-school suspensions (U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights 2014).

There are several explanations for these disparities. The first possibility is that the differences are simply due to differences in children's behaviors. Anti-Black racial ideologies, which cast racial inequalities as the result of deficient Black culture or behaviors, would suggest that Black children, and Black boys in particular, misbehave more than non-Black children. However, research suggests that arguments of

differential behavior by race are not supported by empirical studies (Gregory, Skiba, and Noguera 2010; Skiba and Williams 2014). Studies have suggested that implicit racial biases are involved in producing racial and gender disparities in school discipline (Gilliam et al. 2016; Rudd 2014). Skiba, Michael, Nardo, and Peterson (2002) found that boys often engage in more disruptive behavior than girls, however, they found no such differences for race. Also, the authors suggest that teachers often discipline Black students for more “subjective” infractions (e.g., disrespect), whereas white students were disciplined for more “objective” infractions (e.g., smoking) (Skiba et al. 2002). Furthermore, school-level variables such as quality of academic instruction, racial makeup of teaching and student body, differential processing, and school climate have shown to be strong predictors of discipline disparities (Skiba and Williams 2014).

Still, while there is an abundance of literature on the formalized disparities in school discipline and the macro-level mechanisms that produce these disparities, we know far less about the everyday and mundane processes that are involved. This is particularly the case for research on school discipline in early childhood. There is a need for more qualitative studies that examine how school discipline disparities are constructed through everyday processes. Studies highlight the importance of the more mundane processes in children’s schooling (Ferguson 2001; Hatt 2011; Wun 2014). For example, Wun’s (2014) recent work discusses how much of the literature on school discipline describes formal school discipline (e.g., suspension and expulsion) and its relationship to institutional policies but often neglects the more informal processes that do not get recorded (Wun 2014). Through her ethnographic insights, she details how

Black girls are informally criminalized for seemingly “normal” behaviors such as chewing gum in class (Wun 2014).

Ferguson’s (2001) seminal work also reveals some of the everyday processes that are related to race and gender disparities in school discipline. She writes, “in the course of my study it became clear that school labeling practices and the exercise of rules operated as part of a hidden curriculum to marginalize and isolate Black male youth in disciplinary spaces and brand them as criminally inclined” (Ferguson 2001:2). Thus, Ferguson’s (2001) study of 5th and 6th graders describes the processes by which Black boys, in particular, come to be seen as “bad boys.” A key concept that she develops in this work is the idea of “adultification.” That is, she argues, that Black boys are often seen as older and less innocent, and, thus, more responsible for their behaviors as compared to white boys. From her study one can understand how “controlling images” and labeling influence both adults views of Black boys but also the boys’ sense of self (Ferguson 2001). Although Ferguson’s (2001) work is important, it does not describe in detail the everyday behaviors of Black boys and white boys, and their everyday interactions with teachers. For that reason, the mechanisms that marginalize Black boys and advantage white boys are not clear. Further, her work focuses on older Black boys and educators’ prejudice and criminalized views of them. I argue instead that Black boys’ marginalized status as compared to white boys is also a result of covert practices in school.

Gender Inequalities in Early Childhood Education

Research on gender inequalities in early childhood education describes girls' and women's "advantage" in educational achievement and attainment in comparison to boys and men (Buchmann et al. 2008; DiPrete and Jennings 2012). Relatedly, studies find that teachers give girls better grades; teachers also report that girls have better social/behavioral skills (Buchmann et al., 2008) and report having more positive relationships with girls in comparison to boys (Kesner, 2000). DiPrete and Jennings (2012) found that teachers rate that girls have better social and behavioral skills than boys as early as kindergarten, and they argue that gender differences in children's social and behavioral skills (as rated by teachers) explain much of the disparities in educational achievement between boys and girls. Also, research suggests that boys often exhibit more behavioral problems and more negative academic orientations in the classroom (Buchmann et al. 2008). Thus, this area of research suggests that boys lag behind girls in educational achievement because of gender differences in social and behavioral skills. Left ignored are potential racial/ethnic differences within traditional gender categories.

Racial Biases and Teachers' Perceptions of Children's Behaviors

In addition to gender, race continues to be significant for understanding stratification in various social institutions including education. Recent studies argue that one way in which race continues to matter in education is in teachers' perceptions of children's social/behavioral skills (Downey and Pribesh 2004; Francis 2012; Irizarry 2015b; McGrady and Reynolds 2013; Yates and Marcelo 2014). While DiPrete and Jennings (2012) did not find evidence of gender bias in teachers' ratings of children's

behaviors, previous research suggests that racial biases affect teachers' perceptions of their students. Many of these studies (e.g., Downey & Pribesh, 2004; McGrady & Reynolds, 2013) attempt to assess potential racial biases by examining how White teachers evaluate their students as compared to non-White teachers. Research consistently finds that White teachers often rate Black students behaviors and academic abilities more negatively than White students (Downey and Pribesh 2004; Irizarry 2015b; McGrady and Reynolds 2013; Yates and Marcelo 2014). McGrady and Reynolds (2013) move beyond the Black-White binary to examine variation in White and non-White teachers' perceptions of Asian, Black, Latino, and White students' behaviors and academic abilities. They found that, in comparison to White students, White teachers perceive Asian students more positively and Black students more negatively, while they found few disparities between White students and Latino students (McGrady and Reynolds, 2013). More recently, Irizarry (2015) adds to this literature by moving beyond the traditional measures of race and found substantial disparities in teachers' perceptions within racial groups based on ethnicity, national origin, and generational status. Interestingly, in contrast to significant variation among Asian and Latino students, she found that teachers rate both Black American and Black immigrant students more poorly than White students (Irizarry 2015b).

One limitation of studies of race and teacher perceptions (e.g., Downey & Pribesh, 2004; Irizarry, 2015b; McGrady & Reynolds, 2013) is that they often neglect to take into account children's actual behaviors. Research that examines teacher perceptions of academic ability are often able to control for student test scores (R.

Ferguson, 2003; Irizarry, 2015a; Ready & Wright, 2011; Riegle-Crumb & Humphries, 2012). However, assessments of students' actual behaviors are not available in the data. Consequently, Ready and Wright (2011) discuss how it is problematic to argue that teachers are biased if there is evidence of actual differences among students. Thus, stronger support for arguments of teacher racial bias requires a proxy for past student behavior. Utilizing the longitudinal nature of ECLS-K: 2010-11, I use teachers' prior ratings of students' problem behavior as a proxy in the absence of measures of students' actual behaviors.

Teachers' Perceptions of Student Behavior and Student-Teacher Relationships

Examining race and gender disparities in teachers' perceptions of children's behaviors are certainly important in its own right. However, studies have found that teachers' racial biases widen the Black-White achievement gap (McKown and Weinstein 2008) and affect teachers' academic placement of Black students (Faulkner et al. 2014). In addition to how teachers' perceptions affect students' academic performance, examining how teachers' perceptions of children's behaviors affect student-teacher relationships provides an opportunity to explore a significant social relationship for students. The nature of children's relationships with their teachers has a powerful effect on their educational experiences and outcomes. It is an ominous sign for children's educational futures if they are seen as behaviorally challenging and have more conflict with their teachers, particularly in early childhood. Furthermore, because research suggests that ascriptive categories such as race and gender shape teacher perceptions

of children's behaviors and student-teacher conflict, it is not merely children's actual behavior that affects the nature of student-teacher relationships. Teachers' negative perceptions of students' behaviors may shape their relationships with students, and in turn impact children's educational futures.

Research finds that student-teacher relationships have significant implications for student engagement and academic performance. Higher levels of student-teacher conflict are related to lower academic achievement (Crosnoe et al. 2010; Decker, Dona, and Christenson 2007; Hamre and Pianta 2001; Hughes and Kwok 2007; Roorda et al. 2011). The negative effects of conflictual student-teacher relationships are more pronounced in primary grades as compared to the secondary grades (Roorda et al. 2011). Additionally, the effects of student-teacher relationships in early childhood are long lasting as Hamre and Pianta (2001) found that kindergarten teachers' ratings of their relationships with students predicted academic and behavioral outcomes for students through eighth grade. Students with less positive relationships with their teachers in kindergarten perform more poorly later in their schooling than students with more positive relationships with their teachers in kindergarten (Hamre and Pianta 2001). More positive student-teacher relationships are also related to better behavioral and student engagement outcomes (Decker et al. 2007; Hamre and Pianta 2001; Hughes 2011; Roorda et al. 2011). Researchers demonstrate that Black children tend to have less positive relationships with their teachers than other racial/ethnic groups (Hughes and Kwok 2007).

Overall, while past research suggests that student-teacher relationships have important implications for students' academic trajectories, racial biases may affect teachers' perceptions of their relationships with Black children. Scholars certainly show that racial or gender disparities in student-teacher relationships exist in early childhood (e.g., Murray & Murray, 2004; Saft & Pianta, 2001), yet there is no consensus on why racial or gender disparities in student-teacher relationships exist. It is unclear whether teachers' perceptions of student-teacher relationships are solely a product of actual behavioral differences or if there evidence that they are they subject to racial and gendered biases.

In sum, the literature on gender inequalities in early childhood education has shown that teachers typically rate that girls exhibit better social and behavioral skills than boys. How race adds to this literature remains an important research question. Past research that has examined teachers' perceptions of student behavior argues that Black students are perceived more negatively than other racial/ethnic groups. Lastly, previous studies have shown that teachers report having more conflictual relationships with Black students or boys but whether teachers' perceptions of student problem behavior explain race and gender differences in teacher perceptions of student-teacher conflict remains unsettled. I draw upon intersectional theories of race and gender to frame my study.

CHAPTER 3:

CONSTRUCTING YOUNG BLACK BOYS AS PROBLEMS: RACIAL/ETHNIC DISPARITIES IN TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF BOYS' PROBLEM BEHAVIORS IN KINDERGARTEN

INTRODUCTION

Although children's social and behavioral skills in early childhood are as important as academic skills for determining school success (DiPrete and Jennings 2012; Farkas 2003), previous studies suggest that all children's behaviors are not evaluated equally by teachers. More specifically, past research indicates that teachers view Black students' behaviors more negatively than White and Asian students (Downey and Pribesh 2004; Francis 2012; Irizarry 2015b; McGrady and Reynolds 2013; Rong 1996). The current literature supports the argument that racial biases influence teachers' perceptions of children's behaviors (Downey and Pribesh 2004; McGrady and Reynolds 2013; Yates and Marcelo 2014). However, it remains unsettled how the intersection of students' gender fits into this literature. While recent research suggests that there is variation within racial/ethnic groups based on the intersection of students' race, ethnicity, and immigration status (e.g., Irizarry, 2015b), how teachers' perceptions of children's classroom behaviors vary by the intersection of students' race and gender is left underexplored.

Research on gender in early childhood education has also examined teachers' perceptions of student behavior. This research has consistently found that teachers rate girls as exhibiting better social and behavioral skills than boys in early childhood

(Buchmann et al. 2008; DiPrete and Jennings 2012). Also, as children's behaviors are highly associated with the quality of student-teacher relationships, it is not surprising that studies have shown that girls tend to have more positive relationships with their teachers (Hamre and Pianta 2001; Kesner 2000; O'Connor 2010; Saft and Pianta 2001). If girls typically exhibit better social and behavioral skills in the classroom, we might expect that they would have better relationships with their teachers as compared to boys. In general, girls and women outperform boys and men academically, and many scholars have described this as the "female advantage" in education (Buchmann et al. 2008; DiPrete and Buchmann 2013). However, most studies typically control for race rather than examining the intersection of student race and gender. Thus, while insights about girls' "advantages" in education have been valuable, they often neglect to consider racial differences among boys. Controlling for race is particularly limiting because research suggests that teachers' perceptions of Black boys' behaviors differ dramatically from White boys (Dumas and Nelson 2016; Ferguson 2001; Morris 2005).

Like social and behavioral skills, student-teacher relationships are also critical to student success in school and may help explain the gender gap in educational achievement. Research finds racial and gender differences in teachers' ratings of their relationships with students (Hamre & Pianta, 2001; Hughes & Kwok, 2007; Murray & Murray, 2004). Studies find that teachers rate that they have more conflictual interactions with Black students in comparison to other racial groups (Hamre and Pianta 2001; Murray and Murray 2004). Teachers also rate having more conflictual relationships with boys of all racial/ethnic groups as compared to girls (Hamre and

Pianta 2001; Murray and Murray 2004; Saft and Pianta 2001). While this research indicates that race and gender are associated with the ways that teachers perceive and interact with students, again, the majority of this research examines how race or gender independently shape personal relationships between teachers and students rather than gauge how student-teacher relationships differ based on the intersection of student race and gender. Hence, while previous literature emphasizes how other aspects of students' school experiences are simultaneously racialized and gendered (e.g., A. Ferguson, 2001; E. Morris, 2007; Rieggle-Crumb, 2006; Rieggle-Crumb & Humphries, 2012), it remains unclear how teachers' perceptions of children's behaviors and student-teacher relationships fit into this literature.

Using recent nationally representative data, I attempt to add to the literature by, first, exploring how teachers' ratings of kindergartners' problem behaviors vary by the intersection of students' race and gender. My analyses take into account student, teacher, and school characteristics that may affect teachers' ratings of children's behaviors, including teachers' evaluations of past problem behavior. Secondly, I examine if controlling for teachers' perceptions of students' problem behavior mediates race and gender disparities in teachers' perceptions of student-teacher conflict. My findings suggest that teachers construct young Black boys as problems through racialized biases as they perceive them more negatively than non-Black boys even after taking into account teachers' ratings of past behavior.

METHOD

Participants

This paper uses the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Kindergarten Class of 2010-2011 (ECLS-K: 2011). The ECLS-K: 2011 is a nationally representative sample of children surveyed from the beginning of kindergarten through the end of fifth grade. The sampling frame is a three-stage design: U.S. counties, then schools within counties, and finally students within 968 schools. The scope of the data includes children's social, emotional, cognitive, and physical development. Also, the survey contains questions on children's home environment, home educational activities, school environment, classroom environment, classroom curriculum, teacher qualifications, and before and after-school care.

Study Sample

In this paper, I use two waves of data respectively collected in the Fall of 2010 and the Spring of 2011. The total analytic sample consists of around 14,900 students who have valid data on teachers' perceptions of children's problem behaviors and student-teacher conflict. The analyses focus on Asian, Black, Latino, and White kindergarteners. In order to measure the intersection of student race/ethnicity and gender, I construct a categorical variable that accounts for student race/ethnicity and gender based on parental reports. I create a series of dummy variables for each group (i.e., White girls, Black boys, Black girls, Latino boys, Latino girls, Asian boys, and Asian girls) and designate White boys as the reference group. Table 1 presents means, standard deviations, and descriptions for all variables used in the analyses.

[Table 3.1 about here.]

Dependent Variables

Problem Behaviors. In order to examine teachers' subjective ratings of student problem behaviors, I use one measure of student behavior in the Spring of 2011: externalizing problem behaviors. The externalizing problem behaviors variable measures teacher perceptions of how often students "got angry, acted impulsively, argued, fought, and disturbed classroom activities." Each child's score is computed using the average rating across the five items in the scale. Each item ranges from a 1-4 (1 = Never exhibits this behavior; 4 = Very often/exhibits behavior most of the time).

Student-Teacher Conflict. The second outcome variable is teacher ratings of student-teacher conflict in the Spring of 2011. Each child's score is computed using the average score across the eight-item subscale of the Student-Teacher Relationship Scale (Pianta 2001). The conflict scale measures teacher perceptions of the negative aspects of their relationship with the student. The scale ranges from 1-5 (1 = Definitely does not apply; 5=Definitely applies). Higher scores on the conflict scale indicate that a teacher feels he or she has a more conflictual relationship with the student. For example, one item on the 8-item asks the teacher to rate how much the following statement applies to their relationship with the child: "Dealing with this child drains my energy."

Control Variables

My analyses control for student, school, and teacher characteristics that may affect the association between student race/ethnicity and gender and teacher ratings of student problem behaviors and student-teacher conflict. All control variables are from the fall of 2010. I account for student characteristics by controlling for socioeconomic

status (SES), family structure, age, grade retention, and test scores. Student socioeconomic status is a standardized composite of parental education, occupation, and income. Family structure is a categorical variable that compares students with one biological/adoptive parent, one biological/adoptive parent and one other, and other guardians to two biological/adoptive parents. These variables, particularly SES, are highly associated with student behaviors in the classroom, as shown in literature (Qi and Kaiser 2003). Research also suggests that child's age, whether the child is repeating kindergarten, and students' academic ability may affect teachers' perceptions of students' behavior. In order to account for differences in school environment, I control for school characteristics that may affect teachers' perceptions of children's behaviors and student-teacher conflict. School characteristics include the percent of non-White students in the school, the percent of students that receive free lunch (i.e., the socioeconomic makeup of the school), whether the school is a public or private school, school region, and school locale. My analyses take into account teacher characteristics by controlling for teacher's race, education level, and years of experience. Also, because more than 95 percent of kindergarten teachers in the sample are women, I do not control for teachers' gender in the analyses. Lastly, teachers' perceptions of child's past behavior are likely to strongly influence teachers' current ratings of the students' behavior and student-teacher conflict. Studies find that teachers' perceptions of students' problem behaviors are among the strongest predictors of student-teacher conflict (Buyse et al. 2008; Hamre et al. 2008; Murray and Murray 2004). Therefore, I include a control variable for teacher ratings of children's problem behaviors in the Fall

of 2010. Also, I include this variable in the final model because it allows me to gauge whether differences in teachers' ratings of children's past behavior explain differences in current ratings. We might expect that controlling for teachers' ratings of past behavior will mediate race and gender disparities in teachers' current ratings. If past behavior mediates differences in teachers' current ratings of behaviors for some subgroups and not for others, this may be evidence of bias.

Analytical Strategy

Preliminary analyses were conducted to examine averages in teachers' ratings of children's problem behaviors and student-teacher conflict for each race and gender subgroup. Next, Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon tests were used to conduct tests for differences in means on each of the dependent variables by intersections of student race and gender. White boys serve as the reference group for the tests of differences in means. I also use regression analyses to account for factors that may render the relationship between teachers' ratings and students' race and gender spurious. As both dependent variables are continuous, I use ordinary least squares regression (OLS). In additional analyses not shown, I treated the continuous variables as categorical variables and modeled the results with ordered logistic regression and multinomial logistic regression. These analyses revealed very similar results. OLS regression models were used to examine the association between the intersection of students' race and gender and teachers' perceptions of student problem behavior and student-teacher conflict.

Model 1 includes all of the control variables previously mentioned, except for teachers' perceptions of children's past problem behavior. Thus, this model examines disparities in teachers' ratings of student problem behavior and student-teacher conflict, net of student, teacher, and school characteristics. I add the variable for teachers' perception of children's past problem behavior in Model 2. Thus, the final model examines disparities in teachers' ratings of student problem behavior and student-teacher conflict, net of student, teacher, and school characteristics as well as teachers' ratings of children's past behavior. Using the appropriate weights provided by ECLS-K: 2011, I specify the multi-stage sampling design (i.e., clustering of students within schools and schools within counties) of ECLS-K: 2011 in the regression analyses.

Limitations

Like most studies utilizing large-scale datasets, my study is not without its limitations. One limitation of this study is related to the sampling design of ECLS-K, 2010-2011. Because children were not randomly sampled directly from the U.S. population, children within the sample may be more like each other than the larger population. In order to address this potential source of bias, I specify the multi-stage sampling design in Stata. Also, because the sampling was designed to produce national estimates based on children, not teachers, I did not examine within-classroom variation. The results represent the general experience of students in kindergartens across the U.S. and not how race and gender affect teachers' evaluations of student behavior and student-teacher conflict within a particular classroom. Another limitation is that I only control for teacher's race, but do not examine how teacher's race affects the patterns I

found. Similar to Irizarry (2015b), I argue that the focus of this paper is not on White teacher bias but rather on how examining the intersection of children's race/ethnicity and gender adds to our understanding of differences within racial/ethnic groups as well as within-gender differences. Moreover, the sample sizes of each race and gender category would be considerably reduced, especially because White teachers make up over 80 percent of the teaching force. Past studies of racial mismatch have an easier time examining differences by teacher race because of the larger sample size when looking at student race only, instead of the intersection of student race and gender. Lastly, because there are no measures of actual behavior included in that data I cannot make a strong causal argument that the disparities in teachers' perceptions are due to racial biases. Thus, my results are suggestive for future research that should attempt to address these issues.

RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

Preliminary analyses explore race and gender differences in teachers' ratings of children's problem behaviors and student-teacher conflict. Table 2 reports the means on each of the two outcome variables by student race and gender. It also reports test for differences in means, which examine whether these differences are statistically significant. The reference category for tests for differences in means is White boys. The results reveal that teachers rate that Black boys exhibit more problem behaviors than White boys, while teachers rate that Asian boys and girls of all race/ethnic groups

exhibit fewer problem behaviors than White boys. The difference in means between teachers' ratings of Latino boys and White boys' problem behaviors was not statistically significant. Similarly, for teachers' ratings of student-teacher conflict, I found that teachers rate having more conflictual relationships with Black boys, whereas they rate having less conflictual relationships with Asian, Latino, and White girls. I found no statistically significant differences in teachers' ratings of student-teacher conflict between White boys and Asian or Latino boys. Lastly, I found no statistically significant difference between teachers' ratings of student-teacher conflict between Black girls and White boys.

[Table 3.2 about here.]

Regression Models: Teachers' Perceptions of Problem Behaviors

Given the racial and gender differences in teachers' average ratings of problem behavior and student-teacher conflict, it is important to test how these differences are affected by other characteristics that might render these differences spurious. In Table 3, I present the results from regression models predicting teachers' perceptions of student problem behaviors by student race and gender while adjusting for student, school, and teacher characteristics.

[Table 3.3 about here.]

Model 1 includes all student, teacher, and school-level control variables except teachers' ratings of past behavior. In comparison to White boys, I found that teachers rate that Black boys exhibit more problem behaviors, whereas they rate that Latino boys exhibit fewer problem behaviors. I found no statistically significant difference between

teachers' ratings of White boys and Asian boys in model 1. Also, I found that teachers rate that girls of all four racial/ethnic groups exhibit fewer problem behaviors as compared to White boys.

The second model adds teachers' ratings of students' problem behaviors in the fall of kindergarten. In model 2, I found that adding this variable reduces the disparities from the first model but teachers still rate that Black boys exhibit more problem behaviors as compared to White boys. In contrast, teachers rate that Latino boys exhibit fewer problem behaviors as compared to White boys. I also found that the disparity between teachers' ratings of Black girls and White boys' problem behaviors is no longer statistically significant. This finding suggests that teachers' perceptions of past behaviors mediate the gap in the previous model between Black girls and White boys. In contrast, I found that the differences in teachers' ratings of children's problem behavior between White boys and non-Black girls (i.e., Asian, Latino, and White girls) are persistent in the second model.

Regression Models: Teachers' Perceptions of Student-Teacher Conflict

Table 4 presents the results from regression models predicting teachers' perceptions of student-teacher conflict by student race and gender. In model 1, which controls for all variables except teachers' ratings of past behavior, I found that teachers rate having more conflictual relationships with Black boys as compared to White boys. I found no statistically significant differences in teachers' ratings of student-teacher conflict between White boys and Asian boys. In contrast, in comparison to White boys, I found that White teachers rate having less conflictual relationships with girls of all four

racial/ethnic groups and Latino boys.

[Table 3.4 about here.]

As expected, controlling for teachers' ratings of past problem behavior in model 2 alters the previous results but, interestingly, most of the overall patterns remain. First, I found that teachers rate having less conflictual relationships with White boys in comparison to Black boys, although, the size of the gap and the strength of statistical significance has reduced since the first model. Secondly, I found that teachers rate having more conflict with White boys in comparison to non-Black girls and Latino boys, although, the size of the disparities have also reduced since model 1. However, teachers' ratings of past problem behaviors do explain the difference in teachers' ratings of student-teacher conflict between Black girls and White boys. Thus, my findings for analyses of teachers' perceptions of student-teacher conflict reveal that teachers' continue to perceive that Black boys exhibit more problem behavior than White boys, even after controlling for past problem behaviors. In contrast, there is no disparity between teachers' views of White boys and Asian boys' problem behaviors, and also teachers perceive that Latino boys exhibit fewer problem behaviors than White boys.

DISCUSSION

This article uses nationally representative data to examine the relationship between the intersection of children's race/ethnicity and gender and teachers' perceptions of children's problem behaviors and student-teacher conflict. Prior research suggests that teachers rate that girls demonstrate better classroom behaviors, and

teachers believe they have more positive relationships with girls as compared to boys (Buchmann et al. 2008; DiPrete and Jennings 2012). However, examining the intersection of race/ethnicity adds a layer of complexity to this picture. Previous studies argue that racial biases may affect teachers' perceptions of students' behaviors (Downey and Pribesh 2004; Irizarry 2015b; McGrady and Reynolds 2013). Hence, racial biases may contribute to disparities in teachers' perceptions within traditional gender categories. Drawing upon theories of intersectionality, I attempt to uncover racial differences within traditional gender categories, specifically among boys. I aim to examine how race/ethnicity may complicate ideas about boys' "disadvantage" in comparison to girls regarding teachers' perceptions of students' problem behaviors and student-teacher conflict.

Consistent with existing arguments, my findings indicate that, without taking into account teachers' perceptions of children's past problem behaviors, teachers rate that girls of all four racial/ethnic categories exhibit fewer problem behaviors than White boys. In contrast, teachers perceive that Black boys exhibit more problem behaviors, whereas they rate that Latino boys exhibit fewer problem behaviors as compared to White boys. Taking into account teachers' ratings of past problem behavior reduces the size of the disparity between Black boys and White boys. Yet teachers still rate Black boys as exhibiting more behavioral problems in the classroom as compared to White boys. In short, the findings suggest that White boys retain an advantage over Black boys, in terms of teacher perceptions, due to racial biases about Black boys' behaviors. Therefore, this finding adds nuance to the current literature on gender and teachers'

ratings of children's behaviors. While one might expect that differences in teachers' ratings of past behavior may mediate disparities in teachers' ratings of current behavior, this does not hold true for Black boys who teachers seem to persistently perceive through a racialized lens.

Next, I examine the relationship between teachers' perceptions of children's problem behavior and their perceptions of student-teacher conflict. One hypothesis is that racial and gender disparities in teachers' perceptions of student-teacher conflict may be mediated by differences in teachers' perceptions of children's problem behaviors, especially because children's problem behaviors are shown to be among the strongest predictors of student-teacher conflict (Hamre et al. 2008). I found that teachers rate having more conflictual relationships with Black boys in my sample in comparison to White boys. Taking into account teachers' perceptions of children's past problem behaviors does not account for the disparity in teachers' perceptions of student-teacher conflict between Black boys and White boys. Again, and similarly to my findings for teachers' perceptions of children's problem behaviors, I found that White boys are advantaged" over White boys while Black boys are uniquely disadvantaged.

My findings suggest that, among kindergarteners, teachers' perceptions of Black boys construct them as "problems" even as they engage in similar levels of problem behaviors as non-Black boys. Theories of intersectionality provide an explanation for my findings as the "controlling images" of Black masculinity, and more precisely Black boyhood in this case, regularly depict them as overly aggressive, or "hypermasculine," in comparison to the standards of White masculinity (Collins 2005a, 2006; Ferguson 2001).

Scholars demonstrate how these “controlling images” of Black masculinity map onto the lives of Black boys in adolescence (Ferguson 2001; Goff et al. 2014; Morris 2005; Rios 2011). However, few show how similar patterns emerge even in early childhood.

This study has implications for individuals interested in racial and gender disparities in school discipline, particularly in early childhood. National data on school discipline shows that Black boys are suspended at rates far greater than White boys (U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights 2014). Past research finds that teachers’ perceptions of students’ problem behaviors are key predictors of school discipline (Rocque 2010; Wright et al. 2014). If teachers typically perceive that Black boys exhibit more behavioral problems than non-Black boys, even if in reality this is not the case, this may contribute to the disproportionate racial and gendered patterns in school discipline, specifically the overrepresentation of Black boys.

Recommendations

As a result of this study, I offer two recommendations for educators and schools. First, teachers must be made aware of the ways in which their perceptions of, and relationships with, Black boys are shaped by the “controlling images” (Collins 2000, 2005a) of Black masculinity/boyhood. Teacher education programs should include curricula designed to address these issues. Schools should also include this in teacher training. Secondly, schools have historically been a site of suffering for Black children in general and Black boys in particular (Dumas 2014). K-12 schools need to make concrete changes to become a more hospitable place for them. One way that schools can move

towards this goal is by asking Black boys themselves about their experiences and employing their suggestions for changing school policies and practices. These efforts cannot wait until the later years of Black boys' education but, as my findings suggest, must begin at the very start of their schooling.

Future Research

My analyses examine kindergarteners that are around five to six years old. At this young of age, Black boys might be subject to less harsh judgments by teachers in contrast to older Black boys. Previous research supports this assertion as scholars suggests that racialized perceptions of Black boys are especially apparent beginning at age 10 (Goff et al. 2014; Kunjufu 1995; Ladson-Billings 2011)(Goff et al. 2014; Kunjufu 1995; Ladson-Billings 2011). Still, evidence of more negative teacher perceptions in early childhood is especially concerning, although not surprising given that national data shows that schools suspend Black preschoolers at alarmingly disproportionate rates (U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights 2014). While many qualitative studies find that Black boys are often uniquely marginalized in schools, most of these focus on adolescents (Ferguson 2001; Rios 2011; Sewell 1997). There is a need for more qualitative and quantitative research on the experiences of Black boys in early childhood. My paper finds patterns of marginalization early in the life course of Black boys, even if in seemingly small ways. Qualitative studies can unpack how this happens in everyday life. Little instances of marginalization may add up over the course of Black

boys' lives. Future research can also examine how teachers' perceptions of Black boys' behaviors and student-teacher relationships develop, as they get older.

CONCLUSION

Children's early educational experiences are vital for their later academic trajectories. Research shows that children's behaviors and student-teacher relationships in early childhood are important predictors of later school success (DiPrete and Jennings 2012; Hamre and Pianta 2001). However, my findings suggest that teachers' perceptions of Black boys considerably deviate from those of non-Black boys. Black boys seem to be subject to a racialized perception of their behaviors in that teachers appear to view them as distinctively problematic. While the female "advantage" has been a term that has been used to describe girls' advantages over boys in social/behavioral skills, educational achievement, and educational attainment, my findings suggest that we should pay more attention to within-gender disparities by race/ethnicity, specifically the experiences of young Black boys.

CHAPTER 4:

BOYS WILL BE BOYS?: EVERYDAY INTERACTIONS AND THE RACIALIZATION OF SCHOOL DISCIPLINE IN EARLY CHILDHOOD

INTRODUCTION

A defining feature of the lives of Black males both historically and in the contemporary moment in the United States are cultural representations of them as particularly deviant and criminal in comparison to white males (Collins 2005a; Ferber 2007). These “controlling images” have real world consequences as they relate to incarceration rates and other forms of gendered and racialized marginalization. However, scholars claim that these labels are not solely reserved for Black men but also shape the lives of Black boys, including their schooling experiences (Brown and Donnor 2011; Dumas and Nelson 2016; Ferguson 2001; Kunjufu 1995; Ladson-Billings 2011). This is especially apparent when examining disparities in school discipline. The most recent national data shows that around twenty-percent of Black boys were suspended, while only six-percent of white boys were suspended during the 2011-2012 school year (U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights 2014).

One of the most prominent concepts for understanding the relationship between the racialization of gender, or in this case racialized boyhood, and school disciplinary practices is the concept of adultification. Adultification refers to the ways that Black boys are denied the benefits of “boyish” innocence that white boys retain. In short, research suggests that adults, such as teachers, often racialize boys’ behaviors as

the meaning and consequences of Black boys' behaviors are often qualitatively different from white boys' similar behaviors (Ferguson 2001; Monroe 2005). Previous research suggests that Black boys are viewed and treated as older than they are, and perceived through a lens of criminality. Scholars argue that the process of adultification begins around age ten, whereas younger Black boys are perceived more positively and treated less punitively (Goff et al. 2014; Kunjufu 1995; Ladson-Billings 2011). Yet there are few studies of Black boys' school experiences prior to age ten. Consequently, we know very little about how processes of racialization might impact the schooling of younger boys. It is unlikely that teachers apply criminal labels such as being "marked for a jail cell" (Ferguson 2001) to very young Black boys. It is equally unlikely that Black boys younger than age 10 are not affected by racism, especially because psychological studies suggest that racialized practices such as the surveillance of Black boys are evident as early as preschool (Gilliam et al. 2016). Perhaps racial prejudice and discrimination simply look different at this young of an age. Hence, the controlling image of the criminal Black male may be enacted in everyday interactions in early childhood differently than how it is enacted in adolescence or adulthood. Racialization in early childhood, as compared to adolescence, might be more subtle and covert but nonetheless insidious.

This article extends the literature on racialization in schools by considering the everyday, unrecorded, and informal practices of racialized school discipline in early childhood. The goal of this article is to go beyond investigating the formalized and overt racialization of Black boys' school experiences such as disparities in suspensions rates, which scholars have previously documented (Monroe 2005; Skiba et al. 2002). It is also

to go beyond seeing teachers' prejudices, such as the perceptions of Black boys as "bad boys" or older than they are, as the sole source of their marginalization in schools. Instead, I examine how, even in the absence of overt prejudices against Black boys, similar themes of racialized and gendered marginality were evident in routine disciplinary practices that are not formally recorded. This paper also employs an understanding of race as a social relationship and "political commodity" (Byng 2013), documenting how teachers' disciplinary practices disadvantage Black boys and advantage white boys.

I draw upon a year of qualitative fieldwork in a diverse elementary school, following a group of 30 Black and white boys in first grade. I argue that teachers racialize boys' problem behaviors through routine disciplinary practices. I focus on subtle interactions and show how, even without overt prejudices towards Black boys, teachers discipline and punish boys in ways that reinforce the dominant depictions of race and boyhood. This micro-level approach suggests that even very young boys' school experiences are highly racialized, although in less blatant ways than previously studied given this particular age group. These seemingly mundane disciplinary practices in early childhood reflect young Black boys' subordinate status in a larger racial and gendered hierarchy. Thus, in line with past work, my findings have implications for understanding the role of school socialization processes in maintaining Black abjection more broadly (Dumas 2014; Givens 2016; Watkins et al. 2001; Wilson 1992; Woodson 1933).

RACE, BOYHOOD, AND SCHOOL DISCIPLINE

Theorists of intersectionality suggest that social identities and systems of race and gender do not independently affect the life chances of individuals (Collins 2005a; Crenshaw 1991). Instead, these theorists argue that race and gender simultaneously affect individuals' lives (Collins 2005a; Crenshaw 1991). "Controlling images" or depictions of various social groups shapes how people perceive and interact with these groups, and social policies targeted towards these groups (Brown and Donnor 2011; Collins 2005a). In the United States, the dominant depiction of Black masculinity is one of danger and criminality (Collins 2005a; Ferber 2007; Ferguson 2001). Black males are often depicted as a "problem" in need of discipline and social control in society (Dumas 2016b; Ferguson 2001). Both historically and contemporarily social and educational policies targeted towards Black males focus on fixing their "deviant" behaviors, which are cited as the source of the social problems (e.g., school discipline disparities, mass incarceration) they face, while the role of racism is minimized (Brown and Donnor 2011; Dumas 2016b).

However, these perceptions do not just shape the lives of Black men. Black boys also navigate similar labels in their everyday lives (Ferguson 2001; Goff et al. 2014; Ladson-Billings 2011). The depiction of Black boyhood/masculinity as deviant often serves to dehumanize Black boys while justifying various forms of social exclusion, including death such as the tragic murder of 12-year-old Tamir Rice. Collins (2006), theorizing the relationship between Black masculinity and white supremacy, argues that the idea of "white racial normality" and "Black racial deviancy" depends on a gendered logic of racial difference (Collins 2006). Black boys come to be seen as particularly

dangerous because of historical racist stereotypes and depictions of Black boyhood/masculinity (e.g., the “superpredator”) as uncontrollable, threatening, and hypersexual in the United States (Collins 2005a; Ferber 2007). How these racial meanings, labels, or stereotypes become applied to individuals’ everyday interactions is termed racialization (Omi and Winant 2014). Racialization moves us away from understanding race as simply phenotype or individual characteristics, towards understanding the social processes of race and racism. Critical race scholars emphasize that racism is a social process facilitated through racial ideologies (e.g., as the “bad boy” depiction of Black boys) and structures (e.g., racialized discipline and punishment in schools) (Bonilla-Silva 2015; Feagin 2014; Golash-Boza 2016). Further, race is a “political commodity” used to reproduce racial domination and white supremacy, advantaging those racially categorized as white and disadvantaging people of color (Byng 2013). Using an intersectional perspective requires us to understand race and racism as also gendered. Collins (2005) theorizes how anti-Black racism uniquely affects the lives of Black women and men, or girls and boys (Collins 2005a). These simultaneously gendered and racialized processes are apparent in research on Black boys (Ferguson 2001; Morris 2005) and Black girls (Morris 2016; Wun 2015) experiences with school discipline.

There is an abundance of quantitative data that describe the racial and gendered patterns in school discipline in the United States. From these official statistics, we find Black children and youth are disproportionately suspended and expelled. Black children and youth make up 16% of the student population, yet they represent 32% of students who received an in-school suspension, 33% of students who received an out of school

suspension once, 42% of students who received multiple out-of-school suspensions, and 34% of students who were expelled (U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights 2014). In terms of students who received an out-of-school suspension, and among boys, 20% of Black boys were suspended, compared to 6% of white boys, 9% of Latino boys of any race, and 3% of Asian boys. Thus, these patterns suggest that formal discipline characterizes the everyday experiences of Black boys much more than non-Black boys. While this data represents the entire student population from (K-12), official statistics also demonstrate that a similar pattern is evident in early childhood. Black preschoolers are suspended at alarmingly disproportionate rates. Black children makeup 18% of the preschool population, but comprise 42% of students who received a single out-of-school suspension and 48% of students who received multiple out-of-school suspensions (U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights 2014).

There are several explanations for these disparities. The first possibility is that the differences are simply due to differences in children's behaviors. Anti-Black racial ideologies, which cast racial inequalities as the result of deficient Black culture or behaviors, would suggest that Black children, and Black boys in particular, misbehave more than non-Black children. However, research suggests that arguments of differential behavior by race are not supported by empirical studies (Gregory et al. 2010; Skiba and Williams 2014). Studies have suggested that implicit racial biases are involved in producing racial and gender disparities in school discipline (Gilliam et al. 2016; Rudd 2014). Skiba, Michael, Nardo, and Peterson (2002) found that boys often engage in more disruptive behavior than girls, however, they found no such differences for race.

Also, the authors suggest that teachers often discipline Black students for more “subjective” infractions (e.g., disrespect), whereas white students were disciplined for more “objective” infractions (e.g., smoking) (Skiba et al. 2002). Furthermore, school-level variables such as quality of academic instruction, racial makeup of teaching and student body, differential processing, and school climate have shown to be strong predictors of discipline disparities (Skiba and Williams 2014).

Still, while there is an abundance of literature on the formalized disparities in school discipline and the macro-level mechanisms that produce these disparities, we know far less about the everyday and mundane processes that are involved. This is particularly the case for research on school discipline in early childhood. There is a need for more qualitative studies that examine how school discipline disparities are constructed through everyday processes. Studies highlight the importance of the more mundane processes in children’s schooling (Ferguson 2001; Hatt 2011; Wun 2014). For example, Wun’s (2014) recent work discusses how much of the literature on school discipline describes formal school discipline (e.g., suspension and expulsion) and its relationship to institutional policies but often neglects the more informal processes that do not get recorded (Wun 2014). Through her ethnographic insights, she details how Black girls are informally criminalized for seemingly “normal” behaviors such as chewing gum in class (Wun 2014).

Ferguson’s (2001) seminal work also reveals some of the everyday processes that are related to race and gender disparities in school discipline. She writes, “in the course of my study it became clear that school labeling practices and the exercise of

rules operated as part of a hidden curriculum to marginalize and isolate Black male youth in disciplinary spaces and brand them as criminally inclined” (Ferguson 2001:2). Thus, Ferguson’s (2001) study of 5th and 6th graders describes the processes by which Black boys, in particular, come to be seen as “bad boys.” A key concept that she develops in this work is the idea of “adultification.” That is, she argues, that Black boys are often seen as older and less innocent, and, thus, more responsible for their behaviors as compared to white boys. From her study one can understand how “controlling images” and labeling influence both adults views of Black boys but also the boys’ sense of self (Ferguson 2001). Although Ferguson’s (2001) work is important, it does not describe in detail the everyday behaviors of Black boys and white boys, and their everyday interactions with teachers. For that reason, the mechanisms that marginalize Black boys and advantage white boys are not clear. Further, her work focuses on older Black boys and educators’ prejudice and criminalized views of them. I argue instead that Black boys’ marginalized status as compared to white boys is also a result of covert practices in school.

FINDINGS

Colorblind School Disciplinary Rules and the Racialized and Gendered Reality

In the Classroom

As is the case in many schools, classroom rules center around children being attentive to the teacher, docile, and obedient. Big, colorful, illustrative posters about children focusing on the teacher, being quiet, being nice to their classmates, and being

still were plastered around the classroom. However, the children were around 6-7 years old, and many of them had broken the rules or disobeyed the teacher's expectations (i.e., "misbehaved") in both covert and blatant ways. This was especially, but not solely, true of boys, who were often the most visibly active and defiant in the classroom. Thus, teachers were more often giving reminders and reprimands to boys rather than to girls. Throughout my study, I found that there were only a few boys who were generally docile and seldom received any sort of reprimand in the classroom. There were also a few boys who were seen as especially active and troublesome for teachers. With the exception of one white boy, all of the boys whom teachers felt were the most challenging were Black boys.

While children's misbehavior was evident in the regular classrooms, it was especially apparent in "Specials" (e.g., music class, physical education, etc.). In general, Specials were vastly more disorderly than the normal classroom. Students were louder and more mobile in Specials (e.g., talking, standing up at one's table, or walking around the classroom) than in the regular classroom. Teachers constantly had to redirect the entire classroom by giving a "lecture" about classroom misbehavior. During a typical class period in Specials, the teacher may give several lectures. I observed the following "lecture" to the entire class towards the end of one Science period:

Teacher Leslie frustratingly puts her head on her forehead as if she has a headache and yells, "A lot of people are moving around... touching things... and not paying attention!" She explains that she wanted to play a science game with the students but they've ran out of time because there are too many students not paying attention. Again, she says that the students keep walking around, "touching everything" in the classroom, and not paying attention. Teacher Leslie sternly says, "The next class is Wednesday. We're going to see how it goes and hopefully we

can play the game I planned for us. Otherwise, I will have to write 25 notes home!" The students, seemingly shocked that she would write everyone up, shout "oooohs," "aaahhs," or "daanngs!" Teacher Leslie frustratingly looks over at me, shakes her head in disappointment, and mumbles, "so many people not participating..."

"Lectures" such as these happened frequently, even in the normal classrooms, but especially in Specials, signaling that teachers were aware that many students were misbehaving. In Specials, teachers spent at least a third of class time giving "lectures" and/or reprimanding students. Yet, as I will show in a later portion of the paper, during situations when many students were misbehaving, Black boys were often surveilled and singled-out, while white boys got away with similar behaviors.

On the Playground

Of all the spaces in the school, the playground was the most chaotic. The children received two 15-minute recesses per day, one in the morning and one towards the end of the day. Playground rules sought to maintain a safe environment for the children, especially emphasizing that children should not engage in "rough" (e.g., chasing, pushing, wrestling, etc.) play. In reality, children were constantly screaming, chasing, pushing, and wrestling with each other, even those who were very quiet and docile in the classroom. Again, given performances of gender through play (Thorne 1993), boys were usually more active and aggressive on the playground than girls. Also, boys' play interactions with girls were frequently more aggressive than interactions amongst girls. Typically, there were over 50 students (i.e., two classrooms at a time) on the playground at once. Situated in the tight downtown area of the city, the playground

area was small. Two classroom assistants monitored the active children, while teachers typically remained in the school eating lunch and preparing for the rest of the school day. If classroom assistants noticed that someone was playing too rough, they intervened and reprimanded the child or children. This often resulted in some sort of lecture and/or timeout. Yet because there were about 25 lively children per teacher, it appeared that teachers had to make strategic decisions about who to “keep an eye on.” Over the course of my study I found that racialized surveillance and punishment characterized the experiences of Black boys on the playground.

Educators’ Awareness of Racialized Disciplinary Practices

It was clear that the schools had rules for how children should behave in spaces such as the classroom, the lunchroom, and on the playground. These rules were seemingly race-neutral as teachers usually felt that they were simply judging behaviors. However, in interviews with several educators and administrators, they were highly aware that the school’s disciplinary practices were highly racialized and gendered. In interviews with the two school counselors whose job it was to work with students teachers felt were challenging, both noted that all of the children on their caseloads were Black boys. Like most educators, their jobs were tiring. All day long I would see the two counselors up and down the halls on their way to different classrooms to get children, primarily Black boys, who were deemed to be misbehaving in class.

According to Tr. Sheila, the physical education teacher and school climate specialist, the school had come a long way over the years in regard to racial and

gendered disproportionality in discipline. The school recently moved away from formal exclusionary discipline practices such as suspension and expulsion to more therapeutic practices such as counseling. Tr. Sheila, and her colleagues, questioned the goals of suspension and expulsion, the racism embedded in these practices, and worked to create alternatives. Commenting on the decline in the use of expulsion, she said, “I think that's not even an option anymore, or it has to be really hard fought for that person to get expelled. I think that has shifted. I think that, ever since there's an expectation to discuss race, expulsions have shifted.”

From my interview with educators such as Sheila, it became clear that the school was in the beginning stages of pushing for racial awareness in the school, specifically as it related to school disciplinary problems. Their efforts led to a decline in the use of suspension and expulsion as a means of reprimanding student problem behavior. Thus, it was clear that there were race-conscious efforts to deracialize formal school discipline. Nevertheless, in my observations, more implicit forms of racialized disciplinary practices remained evident in the school. I describe these practices in the subsequent sections.

Everyday Interactions and the Racialization of School Discipline

In the previous section, I illustrated the school's disciplinary rules and the school's attempts to deracialize school discipline. In this section, I move to describe in ethnographic detail the subtle and routine social practices that facilitate the racialization of school discipline. I focus specifically on how teachers' interactional styles with

misbehaving boys shape the process of racialization. In other words, the ways that teachers differentially interact with Black and white boys reinforce racial meanings and inequalities. I argue that these differences in interactions disadvantage Black boys, constructing them as deviant and in need of control. Amongst misbehaving boys, I found racialized patterns in surveillance. Black boys were often “hypervisible” and teachers’ intervention strategies were authoritarian. In contrast, white boys were often “invisible” and when teachers did engage them for misbehavior they were permissive towards them for similar behaviors. Here I define an authoritarian disciplinary approach as an approach that emphasizes strict obedience. In contrast, I define a permissive approach as an approach that is more lax. I found that everyday disciplinary interactions were racialized in: (1) how teachers singled-out boys for misbehavior (2) how teachers monitored boys, (3) how teachers reprimanded boys for misbehavior, and (4) how teachers got boys to comply with their orders.

Singled-Out

As noted previously, during a typical class period there were many children “misbehaving” by being off task, fidgeting with something in their hands, or playing with a classmate. Sometimes these behaviors went unnoticed by teachers. However, sometimes when teachers felt that too many students were getting off track they would give a lecture to the entire group. Other times they only singled-out particular students by stopping what they were doing, expressing some sort of disdain on their face, calling out the students by name, and giving them some sort of reprimand. Yet, over the course

of my observations a consistent theme that emerged was the “singling-out” of Black boys for misbehavior. One example of such “singling-out” occurred when three Black boys were playing on the carpet during Music class:

Yaheem, David, and Akeem are rolling around and laughing on the square carpet to my right. The rest of the class sits around the big circular rug in the middle of the class, in a disorganized circle. Most talk to their friends nearby, moving around in place, while Teacher Colin tries to instruct the group on what they are doing today. As usual, the class is somewhat chaotic. He notices the three boys out of place and yells over to them, “David, Akeem, and Yaheem! Not today! You are supposed to be over here,” pointing at the carpet. The boys look over for a second while continuing rolling around and laughing on the carpet. They mostly ignore him. Teacher Colin stops what he is doing and walks over to the boys. He tells them that he is “not going to have this today! I’ll send you all to the meditation room or I can call your parents!” Akeem and Yaheem stop rolling around and crawl over to the circular carpet, though they are still laughing.

The other students look over, watching what’s happening. Many are laughing. Ahmed, one of the students, yells, “It’s not funny!” David continues to roll around and giggle on the carpet away from the other students. Teacher Colin walks to the classroom phone at the front of the class by the door. He picks up the phone and dials a number. “Can someone come get David please? He is disturbing my class. It is also Akeem and Yaheem but I think they’re going to pay attention. I just need someone to get David. He’s not listening and disrupting my class...” “Okay. Thank you.” He hangs up the phone. While he was on the phone David crawled back over to the circular carpet with everyone else. Teacher Colin walks back to his chair at the front of the class.

Upon first glance, one might assume that Teacher Colin took the appropriate measures to punish David who was being “defiant,” and perhaps he did. However, during this time most of the class was loud, as they typically were in his class. Most children were not looking at Teacher Colin while he was talking, opting to chat, giggle, or play with their friends. Yet the three Black boys, especially David, activated his frustrations and labeled as disrupting “his class.” After this interaction, the school counselor came to get David and took him away while Teacher Colin attempted to continue teaching. About 10

minutes later during the same class, I observed two white boys playing right in front of me while Teacher Colin was teaching.

The class is singing about ways to say hello in different languages. Most of the class is half singing the song and half laughing, joking, and dancing with their friends. Teacher Colin sings and plays the guitar at the front of the circle. Jared and Oliver are away from the carpet a few feet in front of me. They are playing with imaginary guns (using their thumb and index finger), shooting each other. Jared says, "Pow! Shot you in the nuts!" He laughs. Oliver quivers on to his back in fake pain, "Ahh my nuts!" The two continue this game for a while, sometimes pulling each other's arms and pushing off to "shoot" the other one. Teacher Colin doesn't look their way. Neither does the other students. They continue playing, rolling around on the floor until the song ends. After a while, they scoot back to the carpet.

During this time many other students were also talking and moving around. However, at that point Jared and Oliver were the only ones who were away from the carpet. They were directly in front of me, about four feet away from where Yaheem, David, and Akeem were rolling around earlier. However, this time Teacher Colin failed to intervene. It is not clear that he even noticed and, thus, this time no one was reprimanded or sent out of the class. Interestingly, while the three Black boys were rolling around and giggling on the carpet, the two white boys were hitting each other and yelling expletives. Eventually, they went back to their spots. In both cases, both groups of boys were playing in the classroom, which was against the classroom expectations of looking at the teacher and docile bodies. Nevertheless, in such a chaotic environment, with many students talking to each other and moving around, Teacher Colin picked up on the Black boys' misbehaviors while he did not pick up on the white boys' misbehaviors during the same class period. Throughout my time in his class, Colin

often complained to and “lectured” the entire class about their poor behaviors in his class, yet Black boys seem to bear the brunt of being singled-out.

This pattern was not unique to any particular teacher or classroom. I observed similar patterns in the regular classrooms and in other “Specials.” From my observations, it appears that labels of Black boys as especially troublesome, shape their interactions with teachers. Teachers quickly picked up on the behaviors of Black boys, while ignoring similar behaviors from white boys. It remains unresolved whether teachers undoubtedly do not notice white boys or if they just ignore these behaviors. However, in other instances, it was clear that white boys’ blatant misbehavior occurred in plain sight of their teachers. Still, I found that white boys were repeatedly ignored and got away with said misbehavior. Take, for example, this excerpt from my fieldnotes when heading upstairs to the classroom from a bathroom break:

Teacher Ricki holds Warren’s hand (likely to keep him in sight). She holds the door with her right hand while she holds Warren’s hand with her left. While several children are walking past through the doorway entering the stairwell, Warren playfully sticks out his foot and tries to kick them, “Pssh!” He mostly misses but sticks his foot out farther to try to hit one of them. He hits Allison gently with his foot. Allison jerks to her left, looking at Warren with scorn, “Ouch!” She continues walking through the doorway. Teacher Ricki doesn’t say anything to him, as he giggles and continues to try to kick one of the students, “Pssh!” Warren and Teacher Ricki follow behind the rest of the class, who wait at the top of the stairs for her.

I cannot definitively say that teachers noticed when white boys engaged in misbehavior in plain sight of them. Nevertheless, given that there was little going on during these interactions, it was plausible that they may not have felt that it was worth the attention or perhaps they were not paying close attention to them. Still, teachers

often held children's hand to prevent them from engaging in any misbehavior and to keep them in their sight. I found no such examples of Black boys' engaging in misbehavior in plain sight of a teacher without reprimand. More often I found that Black boys were reprimanded when they were further away from a teacher, which speaks to the ways in which surveillance, even from a distance, characterizes their school experiences.

Surveillance

The data suggests that one of the reasons teachers single-out Black boys more so than white boys was that they monitored Black boys more closely. Racialized patterns of surveillance were evident in the classroom but also on the playground. The following fieldnotes excerpt taken while I walked around the playground illustrates the practice of surveillance:

Teacher Anna asks me in a bit of a panic, "where's Daniel?" I, sensing her worry, look around and respond, "I don't know." I continue looking around. "She quickly twists her head and turns, looking around the playground for Daniel. She quickly walks over and asks the two playground assistants, Stacy and Vanessa, "where's Daniel? Have you seen Daniel?" Both of them look around, shaking their head, and responding no. Teacher Anna yells, "Daniel!" She spots Daniel over by the wooden playpen, he is running back towards her. She firmly says to him, pointing, "Daniel you can't be over there... I told you, you have to be over here! In this area...!" She waves her hand to her right by the basketball court area where she first asked me where Daniel was. Daniel with a slight smirk, nods his head yes, and runs away. Teacher Anna looks at me like she is frustrated and shakes her head. She walks towards me, "I have to keep an eye on him. He can't play with all of the kids. He can choose two friends to play with and they have to play over there (pointing), where I can see them."

These sorts of formal surveillance practices were commonplace on the playground. With so many children energetically running around on the congested playground, it seemed that teachers had to come up with strategies to monitor students who they felt could be particularly troublesome. I did not encounter any similar reflections from teachers about white boys. In the classroom, teachers would often disclose to me while looking over at an individual child or group of children that they “have to watch” or “keep an eye on.” However, although they did not verbalize this, the students that they referenced were largely individual or groups of Black boys.

I also found that Black boys were often singled out and subject to surveillance for playing “rough,” even when they were playing with white boys. I recall this observation on the playground:

A group of six boys are playing on the “watchtower” end of the jungle gym. The tower is about 4ft x 4ft so it is a very tight space. Five of the boys are from Teacher Ricki’s class and two are from Teacher Lita’s class. Two of the boy’s are Black –Zaleeq and Karim, and four are white –Joshua, Charles, Warren, and Ethan. Five of the boys are on the tower, playfully pushing one another around and yelling. Charles is the only one that is not on the tower but rather is on the green net that is connected to the tower. Charles climbs the net and hangs on while he tugs on Zaleeq’s shoe. Zaleeq, bumping against the others boys, hops on one leg and pulls his leg from Charles who tries to hold on. Teacher Raven looks up at them from over by the swings, she yells, “Karim! No pushing!” All of the boys stop and look over at her, still bumping against each other. She walks towards them, looking up, “I’m watching you Karim! Play nice!” The boys continue screaming, pushing, and bumping each other. Teacher Raven says, “Zaleeq, not so rough! I won’t tell you again!” Zaleeq stops pushing and frowns at her.

It was interesting that both Black and white boys were grouped in this interaction, yet the teacher only singled-out and observed the Karim and Zaleeq. Thus, racialized practices of singling-out certain students and surveillance were not mutually

exclusive. When Black and white boys played together, Black boys were regularly singled-out for their behaviors and constantly monitored during these interactions. School rules were meant to create expectations of docility in the classroom and non-aggressiveness on the playground. Nevertheless, students, especially boys, broke these rules, especially during recess. The rules were broken both out of and in plain sight of adults, yet my findings suggest that the enforcement of the rules was a racialized process.

Punishments

In addition to racialized patterns in singling-out and surveillance, I also found evidence for racialized patterns in punishment. Punishment on both the playground and in Specials happened generally through the use of timeouts. Although less common than timeouts, I observed several Black boys being sent to another class and to the meditation room for misbehavior in Specials. I did not observe any white boys being sent out of class or to the meditation room. More commonly, students were asked to sit in the timeout chair in the classroom and the timeout bench on the playground. In the classroom, there was a chair or beanbag, typically at the back of the classroom, for children to sit in when they were told to “take a break” or “calm down” for misbehaving. On the playground, students were asked to sit on a concrete barrier that circled around the jungle gym area, or if they were outside the jungle gym area they were told to sit on the wooden stage.

Timeouts during recess were one of the most shameful and emotional moments for children. Normally, the child sat on the designated space, sometimes sobbing, listening to a teacher talk at them sternly. Afterwards, the teacher would walk away and the children were expected to remain seated until they were told they could play again. Sometimes children tried to test the waters and return playing without permission, but teachers often noticed, and pointed and/or harshly told them to sit back down. For instance, one day when walking out to the playground I observed a Black boy sitting on the timeout bench:

Sitting on the concrete fence, Jonathan digs his feet into the reddish-brown wood chips as he looks down at the ground. I sit next to him and say, "Hey Jonathan." Jonathan looks over and mumbles with a slight resistance and frown, "Hi Teacher Calvin." I ask, "What happened?" Again with a slight resistance like he is not really in the mood for talking, Jonathan replies in a quiet voice, "...playing too much." He continues lifting and digging his feet back into the woodchips, now watching the rest of the kids run around the playground. I sit next to him for a while but don't ask him any more questions. After a couple of minutes Jonathan tries to get up and go play. He slowly gets up, watching for Teacher Akira who is about 15 feet away in the middle of the playground talking to her classroom assistant, Teacher Madalyn. He walks under the jungle gym and hides behind a pole, giggling at Laila who runs towards him. Teacher Akira, perhaps seeing him out the corner of her eye, turns around towards him and gives him a stern look, snaps her finger, "Jonathan! No!" and points towards the concrete barrier for him to sit back down. Jonathan's face immediately drops to a frown, almost like he is about to cry. He turns around and slowly walks back to the concrete fence and plops down.

I found that timeouts during recess commonly characterized the often miserable experiences of Black boys. Usually they woefully, or angrily, sat on the sidelines watching other children play. Sometimes boys were asked to sit out part of, or the entire, recess period for misbehaving in the classroom, and other times it was for misbehavior (e.g., playing too rough) on the playground. One way that teachers

punished children was to take “time off” their recess (e.g., two minutes, four minutes). In the classroom, I often saw teachers threaten children, typically Black boys, by telling them that they would lose recess time if they did not comply with their demands. On the playground, if a child, or children, were caught playing too aggressively a teacher would come over and tell them to sit down on the timeout bench, frequently giving them a lecture about appropriate and inappropriate behavior. My data suggest that being caught and punished for misbehavior such as rough play on the playground was not a meritocratic process. Related to the previous findings, it seemed that racialized surveillance played a role in which boys were caught and punished, which ones got away with similar behaviors.

In addition to playing too aggressively, another source of punishment during recess I found was when children continued playing after the whistle was blown, signaling the end of recess. For example, I observed this interaction after the classroom assistants called the children to line up at the end of recess:

Many students continue playing but after a couple of reminders they line up at the entrance to the jungle gym area. Karim and Javier are still on the jungle gym, pushing, tugging, running, and laughing with one another. Teacher Raven, at the front of the line, yells, “Karim! Javier! Come on! It’s time to line up for lunch! Get down!” The two boys continue playing. Karim jumps down from the jungle gym and runs, further away, towards the swings. Javier follows, chasing him. Teacher Raven walks over deeper into the jungle gym area, calling them, “Karim and Javier! That’s second recess!” (She is telling the two boys that they will have to sit out their second recess later today) She walks away towards the front of the line and begins leading the rest of the children towards the basketball court area. Javier continues chasing Karim as they jog towards the line. Karim puts his arm around Javier’s shoulder. Javier hunches over, giggling as they lag behind the rest of the group heading into the school building.

Students often continued playing after the whistle blows. Most children lined up haphazardly after a few reminders from the teachers. The lining up process was always chaotic as children continued to talk to their friends and/or play while lining up. The classroom assistants typically spent at least a couple of minutes trying to get the children to line up properly in two parallel lines. However, there were always some students, typically boys in my observations, who lagged behind, continuing to play after being reminded to line up. The vast majority of these situations involved boys continuing to play. Seldom did I observe girls engaging in this behavior after the whistle had blown. Sometimes teachers stayed behind and gave some sort of reprimand to the students who continued to play such as taking time off their next recess. Other times it appeared that they did not see, or at least do not look for, boys who continued to play after they blew the whistle. During the study, I rarely saw Black boys get away with continuing to play after recess was over. More commonly, however, I observed white boys getting away with playing after the whistle. I recall an example of two white boys who were playing rough after the whistle and were not reprimanded:

Teacher Vanessa blows the whistle signaling the end of recess. Most of the kids stop what they are doing. Some scream and run towards the entrance of the playground. Others walk and talk with their friends. I notice Jimmy and Oliver are the only children still on the playground wrestling. Teacher Madalyn and Teacher Anna gather their first graders and walk out of the playground towards the school building by the basketball courts so that they can line up for lunch. Oliver and Jimmy continue wrestling in the wood chips, rolling around. Jimmy hunches over Oliver, who is on his back trying to resist. Oliver puts his foot onto Jimmy's stomach and Jimmy topples over on his side. They roll around like this for a couple of minutes, continuing to struggle and scream. I am not entirely sure if they are actually fighting or play fighting but it seems they are play fighting based on their gestures and sounds. I slowly walk towards the children lined up but keep an eye on the two boys. They both struggle to get up, while Jimmy pulls on Oliver's red polo school shirt while he tries to evade him. Oliver pushes him off

of him and runs away to catch up to the rest of his class. Jimmy chases after him with both of his arms extended, screaming, “aarggghhh.... ummpphh!” One of the boys has pieces of woodchips in his curly red hair from rolling around on the ground.

Teacher Madalyn doesn’t notice them because is occupied with Jonathan who is running around in a circle by where they are lining up. She yells, “Jonathann!!” and counts down from five, sternly staring at Jonathan, and lifting her hand in the air, gesturing, “five... four...” Jonathan continues laughing but stops running and gets in line. She says, “That’s two minutes from second recess!” Jonathan frowns as she turns around tells the children to follow her as they head in the building for lunch. While Teacher Madalyn was focused on Jonathan, Jimmy and Oliver blended in at the back of the line unseen as they get in line.

In this scenario, the two white boys went unnoticed as they aggressively wrestled in the jungle gym area. Interestingly, while they did not get caught, Jonathan was reprimanded for running around where they were lining up. My data suggests that the “hypervisibility” of misbehaving Black boys’ on the playground was in relation to the relative “invisibility” of misbehaving white boys.

In addition to relative visibility and patterns of punishment, I found that when white boys received some kind of reprimand for misbehaving, it was less punitive than those that Black boys received. A reoccurring theme in my data is that teachers used verbal reprimands, rather than a punishment such a timeout, for disciplining white boys who misbehaved. Further, I found that after verbally reprimanding white boys for their behavior, rather than just singling-out white boys who misbehaved, teachers typically gave a “lecture” to the rest of the class. Take, for example, this interaction during a sing-along “dance party” during Spanish one morning:

The music blasts from the computer speakers and a YouTube video with the words playing on the screen. The children frantically dance around the carpet. It is congested with so many children moving around such a small space. They twist and turn, sometimes bouncing off each other’s bodies, laughing and screaming

the words to the song. A couple of minutes into the song, Joshua leans forward and pushes Mackenna from behind, knocking her over, and causing a domino effect. Three other students slowly topple on top of her, tripping over her legs. She screams, "oowww!" Joshua looks on in laughter. Teacher Lisa runs over to the laptop and stops the music. She comes back to help the children up. "Mackenna are you okay?" she asks. Mackenna is visibly in pain and crying. Teacher says, "That was not a safe body Joshua!" Joshua laughs and skips to the left, away from the carpet towards the tables. Teacher asks Priscilla if she can take Mackenna to the nurse to get an ice pack. Priscilla puts her arm around Mackenna as if she can't walk, "are you okay?" Mackenna holding her head, grimaces in pain, and sobs as they leave the classroom together. The teacher says, "Okay first graders... back to your seats." She doesn't say anything else to Joshua but lectures the entire class about being safe. She tells them if they want to have another "dance party" they have to stay in their own space.

When children were given a bit of freedom in the classroom they often tested the boundaries by engaging in behaviors that would otherwise be unacceptable (e.g., jumping around and bumping into each other). It was not until someone got hurt that the "party" ended. Joshua ended up knocking Mackenna over by pushing her. The teacher hurried to help up the students and gave Joshua a quick verbal reprimand, telling him that he did not have a "safe body." Yet she did not punish him in anyway or say anything more to him. Instead, she gave the entire class a lecture about safety for next time. In instances such as these, white boys, while being reprimanded for their behavior, did not experience the same extent of punishment that I observed Black boys experience. Taken together, the findings suggest that Black boys' relative hypervisibility in school spaces led to being singled-out and aggressively punished for misbehavior, while white boys' behaviors were relatively invisible and went unpunished. When white boys were acknowledged for problem behaviors, their reprimands appeared to be less severe and were more communal.

Strategies for compliance

An emerging theme from my fieldwork was that teachers' strategies for getting misbehaving boys to comply with their orders were racialized, especially when boys did not do what the teacher said immediately or when they challenged the teacher's authority. When children were reprimanded for misbehavior it was expected that they would comply with what the teacher said, such as sitting properly in their seat or being quiet. I found that both Black and white boys sometimes resisted what a teacher said, however, their interactions with teachers were racialized in these situations. For instance, one day while the class was getting ready to watch a movie on a huge flat screen television on top of a black cart I observed this interaction:

Asaad pulls his chair from the back of the classroom where his assigned seat is, up to the center of the classroom, in line with the TV, and sits down. The children were only instructed to move their chairs a few feet away from their tables and face the TV. Teacher Gabriela notices Asaad and calmly says, "Asaad, move back to your spot please. I did not call you to come up here. Move back." She turns around to press play on the DVD player. Asaad stays put, just staring at her as if he didn't hear her. Teacher Gabriela turns around, sees that Asaad is still sitting in the same spot, and immediately starts yelling, "Move your chair right now!" She walks towards Asaad, pointing back at his table, "I said move back! Now! Right now!" Asaad face frowns up and it looks like he about to cry. He furiously pushes his feet against the ground, moving his chair backwards without looking back. On his way back he bumps into Alexis's chair. He, visibly angered, quickly turns around picks up his chair and moves it to his normal spot.

In my observations, when Black boys did not comply with teachers' orders, teachers used a harsh tone with them. While being angered or saddened, the boys typically complied with the teachers orders in these situations. From my fieldnotes, I rarely recall a time when a student continued to resist the teacher's orders after the

teacher yelled at them. Teachers also resorted to the use of physical force for Black boys who did not immediately comply with their orders. Physical force here is defined as the subtle ways that teachers would gently but physically move a child to get them to do what they wanted. One example from my fieldnotes occurred when:

Loyal is at the table behind his assigned table, leaned over on the table with his forearms, talking to Zaleeq. I cannot hear what they are saying but Teacher Lisa notices him and calls him in a stern but calm voice, "Loyal! Back to your seat! Loyal..." Loyal, turns around for a second to look at Teacher Lisa, turns back around and continues talking, seemingly ignoring her. The teacher walks over to him and grabs his shoulders with both hands, gently turning him around and guiding him back to his seat, "Back to your seat." Loyal smirks as she moves him to his seat.

In this example, one can see that the teachers' actions were not necessarily malicious or harsh. Teachers expect that students will do what they say when they say it. When students did not immediately comply with the teacher's directives, this frequently led to the teacher using additional strategies for compliance. My findings suggest that harsh or coercive practices such as yelling or using physical force, commonly characterized the experiences of defiant Black boys but not white boys. Thus, teachers' approaches to interacting with defiant Black boys showed to be more authoritarian in nature.

Comparatively, I found that teachers used a suggestive tone and negotiation to get defiant white boys to comply with their orders. Teachers seemed to have more patience when it came to dealing with white boys. Accordingly, teachers' interactions with white boys who challenged their authority often were lengthier and involved negotiation, rather than employing harsh directives or physical force. Take, for instance, this observation of a teacher's interaction with a white boy during reading one morning:

Nicholas fluctuates between spinning around on the colorful carpet by the bookshelves and fidgeting with the books. The rest of the students are at their tables waiting for Teacher Ricki. Some quietly whisper with to each other while others sit quietly, focusing on the teacher. Teacher Ricki is hooking up the projector to the TV and she doesn't notice Nicholas until after she is finished. She looks over and says calmly, "Nicholas, please sit down." Nicholas, now sitting on the floor pulling out books from the shelf, seemingly ignores her. The teacher looks away, back towards the rest of the class, and begins introducing today's reading activity and worksheet. Nicholas does not go back to his seat. Instead, he gets up, spins around for a bit again then fumbles through more books. A few moments later, Teacher Ricki notices him again. "Nicholas." He looks back at her with a smirk. "Please sit down," she says.

Nicholas and Teacher Ricki continued with this back and forth a couple of more times.

Eventually, Teacher Ricki gave Nicholas a warning and he went back to his seat. As in this excerpt, I found that teachers exhibited patience with incomppliant white boys by giving them multiple reminders. They also typically did not stop what they were doing in order to discipline white boys, whereas they did with Black boys.

In addition to being more patient, teachers also seemed more playful when interacting with white boys who challenged their authority. Take, for instance, this observation while heading out for recess:

The students are heading out with Teacher Raven for recess, lining up in the hallway along the way in a single file. Jacob is at the front of the line next to Teacher Raven, who is facing the students. She tells Jacob, "you haven't had a good day today Jacob, you have 2 minutes." (Referring to two minutes away from recess) Earlier, Jacob had been walking, and sometimes skipping, around the class during math when he was supposed to be at his table. Jacob playfully responds with a slight smirk, "1 minute!" Teacher Raven looks down at him indifferently and replies, "2 minutes Jacob." "1 minute," Jacob quickly responds again. "Okay Jacob, 5 minutes," replies Teacher Raven in a snarky voice. "1 minute," says Jacob. He has a big smile on his face, looking up at her. Teacher Raven, shakes her head, "5 minute Jacob," and tells the rest of the class to follow her downstairs. She looks over at me and shakes her head with a chuckle then turns around, pushes the purple door behind her open, and heads through the doorway and leads the children down the stairs.

Even though teachers expected that students would comply with their orders, students did challenge their authority at times. In my data, I find a racialized pattern in the strategies teachers use to deal with such challenges. Black boys were yelled at or physically forced to comply, whereas teachers had more patience with white boys. I did not observe any cases where defiant white boys were harshly yelled at or physically moved for not complying with a teachers order. Importantly, among Black boys, I did find that, though uncommon, sometimes teachers gave them the same leeway as white boys but in the same day they could go from being ignored for misbehavior, being yelled at, negotiated with, to being yelled at again. Hence, defiant Black boys' experiences were characterized by irregularity. Still, a strong theme of harsh strategies for compliance emerged from my data. In contrast, I observed numerous times when white boys defied a teacher's orders and teachers attempted to negotiate with them, gave them multiple reminders, or they ignored them completely. Relatedly, the affect that teachers gave off during these interactions were more lighthearted such as how Teacher Raven shook her head but chuckled after her interaction with Jacob. In contrast, teachers' interactions with Black boys appeared to be given more weight, as their affect were strict and punitive.

Disconfirming Evidence

Although my data reveal how school disciplinary practices were racialized and gendered in informal and subtle ways, the process of racialization was not static. The

racialization of school disciplinary practices occurs through differential responses to and interactions with Black boys and white boys who disobeyed the classroom or playground rules. However, there were times when teachers responded to and interacted with both Black and white boys in a similar manner. Although not a consistent theme in my data or previous research, I highlight these examples to illustrate the malleability of racialization in everyday life. Critical race scholars who are interested in studying race and racism in order to eradicate racial inequality should engage such examples of malleability as they provide glimpses into what more just, or deracialized, structures could look like on the ground. Two examples of deracialized practices were apparent in my findings as disconfirming evidence: (1) Black boys getting away with misbehavior, and (2) white boys being reprimanded and punished.

Though I find that Black boys were often closely monitored, this was in no way a fixed process. My data illustrates several examples of situations where Black boys were engaging in rough play, either amongst themselves or with white boys, for example, and teachers do not appear to notice. During interactions where no adults intervened nothing happened in the end. The boys go about playing with, wrestling with, and chasing each other. For example, I observed this interaction between a Black boy and white boy during recess one cloudy and windy afternoon:

Karim chases Charles around and around the playground. He catches up to him and the two play fight. Karim fakes like he punches Charles in the stomach, while Charles jumps back in fake pain. Charles then pushes Karim off of him, and runs away screaming at the top of his lungs, "aaaahhhhh!" Karim, out of breath, slowly chases after him with a huge smile. Charles darts under the jungle gym and around the tower past me. The two of them end up to my far left as Charles stops to catch his breath and Karim slowly grabs him from behind, wrestling him to the ground. Charles falls on his right side into the woodchips, his glasses fall

off of his face into the woodchips. Karim stops and looks around, as if to see if any adults saw what happened. No one notices. Charles slowly sits up, dusts himself off, and picks up his glasses. He looks like he is a little shaken up. He has a slight grimace. Karim leans over, talking to him, and puts his hand on Charles's shoulder. He doesn't help him up but Charles slowly gets up on his own. Karim runs away laughing and looking back at Charles, and Charles chases after him screaming loudly again. The two continue running around the playground, every so often bumping into each other.

What is telling about this scenario is that, when no one recognized or intervened in the boys' rough play, there was no racialized disciplinary action or punishment. Although seemingly obvious, this instance reveals that when Black boys get away with breaking the rules it challenges the process of racialization and reveals its limits. Teachers could not monitor every single interaction in the classroom or on the playground. This provided opportunities for Black boys to experience some of the advantages that commonly characterized white boys experiences, namely invisibility. Interestingly, however, is the fact that Karim looks around to see if any adults noticed what happened. It is possible that he too understood that the consequences of his actions might be interpreted and treated punitively.

Just as it was not the case that Black boys always got in trouble for disobeying school rules, it was also not the case that white boys never got in trouble for misbehavior. Take, for example, this situation where a misbehaving white boy was reprimanded during music:

Lucas rolls around the back of the class away from the carpet and the other students. Teacher Colin, standing, plays his keyboard in front of the class and expects the class to also play their keyboards along with him when he tells them to. Most of the students are facing him spread across the floor with electronic keyboards and headphones on their ears. Some are following along with the teacher and others are just pressing keys on the keyboard. Lucas, on the other

hand, appears to be in his own world. He playfully kicks his leg against the ground, slowly spinning himself around in a circle. The headphones are still on his head but they are unplugged from the keyboard, the cord slides across the floor as he spins. Teacher Colin notices him, stops playing his keyboard, calling calmly but loud enough so he can hear him, "Lucas! Lucas!" Lucas stops immediately and looks back at Teacher Colin with a smirk. Teacher Colin puts his hand out to his side, "What are you doing?" Lucas doesn't say anything. He continues to smirk. Teacher Colin sighs and tells Lucas he needs to "chill out" (take a timeout in the chair). Lucas nonchalantly gets up and sits in the chair at the back of the classroom. Teacher Colin goes back to playing his keyboard and instructing the students. Lucas simply sits and looks around the classroom.

Although over the course of my time in the school I found that when teachers disciplined white boys, it typically occurred when it was plainly obvious that they were not where they were supposed to be or not doing what they were supposed to be doing. My findings suggest that, because white boys were not subject to the same surveillance as Black boys, they often eluded discipline and punishment. This is related to past research that found that Black youth were disciplined for more subjective infractions while white youth were disciplined for objective infractions (Skiba et al. 2002). However, this study demonstrates that, when the infractions were similar, white boys were more likely to be disciplined for infractions that were more overt such as Lucas rolling around in the back of the class.

Evidence that white boys are also disciplined and punished in school is not surprising given the national school discipline data. However, the disproportionate suspension of Black boys (20%) in comparison to white boys (6%) suggests that we need to investigate exactly what happens in schools to produce these patterns. Given the both colorblind ideology and depictions of Black children in particular as deviant, some might imagine that the reason for racial disproportionality in school discipline is due to

differences in behavior. However, recent studies suggest that racial differences in children and youth's behavior does not account for racial disproportionality (Gregory et al. 2010; Monroe 2005; Rudd 2014; Skiba et al. 2002; Skiba and Williams 2014). Instead, school discipline scholars argue that racialized biases and differential treatment are the cause of disproportionality (Gregory et al. 2010; Skiba et al. 2002). Still, because studies have largely been quantitative, we know very little about racialization and the everyday processes of school discipline, especially prior to middle school. The argument of this paper is not that Black boys are more likely to be disciplined and punished than similarly behaving white boys, although my data is consistent with this argument. Numerous studies currently support this conclusion (Monroe 2005; Noguera 2003; Skiba et al. 2002; Wallace et al. 2008). Instead, I seek to show, through detailed description, how unrecorded and routine disciplinary practices racialized discipline and punishment in early childhood. In doing so, my findings suggest that young Black and white boys' experience of discipline and punishment are qualitatively different, reproducing racialized and gendered meanings and inequalities. We should pay attention to these unrecorded and routine but insidious practices of racialization in future research on race, gender, and education, particularly in early childhood.

CONCLUSION

This article extends the literature on racialization in schools by examining the role of teachers' everyday disciplinary practices and how interactions reflect the controlling images of Black boyhood. The prevailing literature supports the idea that

adults are more likely to perceive Black boys as less innocent and more responsible for their behaviors, in comparison to white boys, beginning around age 10 or 4th grade (Ferguson 2001; Gilliam et al. 2016; Goff et al. 2014; Kunjufu 1995; Ladson-Billings 2011). This “bad boy” label lingers over the everyday experiences of many Black boys in school, even those who are more compliant with school rules (Ferguson 2001). For example, Ferguson (2001) finds that teachers referred to some Black boys as “marked for a jail cell.” However, in contrast to past work, the teachers in my study never labeled any of the Black boys in the study as “bad.” Perhaps this is a result of the age of the boys in my study. Nevertheless, the fact that their disciplinary interactions with boys were racialized speaks to how covert and subtle, and perhaps unconscious, practices can still reflect larger racial meanings in early childhood, even in the absence of outward prejudice. White racial domination is not solely maintained through overt prejudices, or formal policies and practices, but also through covert practices. Scholars interested in race and school discipline must also detail the ways that racism is maintained through informal and subtle practices that are not formally recorded, especially when examining how race works at such a young age.

The phrase, “boys will be boys,” suggests that there is a universal experience and interpretation of boyhood. Yet theories of intersectionality indicate that gender intersects with other forms of social positions including race. Thus, while “boys will be boys” may be used to naturalize white boys’ experiences and performances of disobedience in school and society at-large, researchers argue that Black males are not given the same benefit of the doubt, resulting in more punitive treatment for similar

behaviors (Dumas and Nelson 2016; Ferguson 2001; Goff et al. 2014; Ladson-Billings 2011). Schools serve as a crucial socializing institution into the existing racialized and gendered hierarchy in the United States. Scholars argue that a “hidden curriculum” permeates schools and sorts students into their social position based on social identities (Anyon 1980; De Lissovoy 2012; Ferguson 2001; Giroux and Penna 1979). In the context of the education of Black children and Black boys in particular, school socialization processes function to maintain Black subordination and white supremacy (Givens 2016; Watkins et al. 2001; Wilson 1992; Woodson 1933). In a society where Black boys are suspended at vastly disproportionate rates that parallel incarceration rates (Wagner 2012), the mundane processes of discipline and punishment, even in early childhood, appear to reflect this social reality.

CHAPTER 5:

TOO MUCH TO HANDLE?: RACIAL/ETHNIC DISPARITIES IN TEACHER CONTACT WITH THE PARENTS OF BOYS IN FIRST GRADE

INTRODUCTION

Communication between teachers and parents is important for children's social and academic trajectories. Numerous studies demonstrate that communication between schools and parents are positively associated with both social and academic outcomes (El Nokali, Nermeen E. et al. 2010; Fan and Chen 2001; Hill and Tyson 2009; Jeynes 2007). The purpose of this chapter is to analyze racial/ethnic disparities in first grade teachers' contact with boys' parents about (1) behavior problems, (2) academic problems, and (3) accomplishments.

The first empirical chapter provided evidence of racial bias in teachers' perceptions of boys' problem behavior and student-teacher conflict. More specifically, the first chapter suggested that young black boys are uniquely disadvantaged and penalized in comparison to non-black boys. Teacher perceptions of black boys constructed them as deviant and troublesome, even as they behave similarly to non-black boys. The second empirical chapter builds upon the first by taking a qualitative approach to understanding the unique racial and gendered biases that black boys face in their schooling. The findings suggest that teachers' daily disciplinary interactions with black boys mirror larger perceptions of the deviant black male. I found that teachers took an authoritarian approach to discipline with black boys and a permissive approach

with white boys. The current chapter builds upon these two previous chapters by investigating the link between boys' problem behavior, as rated by teachers, and communication with parents. Thus, this chapter moves beyond looking at the relationship between children and teachers to also investigate how racial meanings affect teacher-parent communication.

While researchers have long studied racial/ethnic inequalities in parental involvement in education (LeFevre and Shaw 2012; Robinson and Harris 2014; Robinson, Keith and Harris, Angel L. 2013; Turney and Kao 2009), this research has mostly been one-sided in that scholars ask if, how, and why parents contact schools or become involved in their children's schooling (Cherng 2016). Consequently, research has taken a parent-initiated approach to understanding the successes and challenges of racial minority parental involvement in education. Very few studies examine how race shapes how schools or teachers contact parents. Further, even amongst studies who do examine race and teacher communication with parents (e.g., Cherng 2016), these studies do not consider early childhood and the intersection of gender. Hence, we know very little about how racial inequalities in teacher communication with parents might vary by age or gender. Racial/ethnic disparities may look different in early childhood versus adolescents, or amongst boys, for example.

Prior research suggests that teacher perceptions of children's behavior and academic ability are shaped by racial biases (Downey and Pribesh 2004; Gilliam et al. 2016; Irizarry 2015a; McGrady and Reynolds 2013; Yates and Marcelo 2014). This line of work consistently demonstrates that black children are uniquely disadvantaged as

teachers judge and treat them more harshly. Yet it is unclear how racial biases in teachers' perceptions of children behaviors and academic abilities may shape how teachers communicate with parents, particularly about disciplinary issues. This is an important limitation of the current literature because teacher communication with black children's parents, and specifically the parents of black boys in the case of this study, may be important for shaping black parents' understanding of their child's school behavior and academic potential.

ANALYTICAL STRATEGY

This chapter uses two-sample tests for proportions to examine racial/ethnic disparities in teacher contact with the parents of boys in first grade. Two-sample tests provide a descriptive overview of these patterns. I then use logistic regression gauge how student, teacher, and school characteristics may shape teacher communication with parents. Lastly, predicted percentages are used to illustrate rates of teacher contact with the parents of boys who teachers rate (1) rarely, (2) sometimes, (3) often, and (4) very often exhibit problem behaviors. All analyses used the appropriate primary sampling units and sample weights provided by ECLS-K: 2010-11 to adjust for its complex sampling design. Table 1 provides a description of all of the variables used in the analyses.

(Table 5.1 about here.)

RESULTS

Bivariate Relationship between Race/Ethnicity and Teacher Contact with Boys' Parents

To demonstrate differences in teacher contact with boys' parents, Table 2 presents the proportion of parents of children contacted by first grade teachers for behavior problems, schoolwork problems, and accomplishments. My findings show that teachers contact a higher proportion of black boys' parents (63%) for behavior problems as compared to white boys' parents (47%). Second, teachers contact a lower proportion of Asian boys' parents for behavior problems (36%) as compared to white boys. These differences are significant at the $p < .001$ level. For teacher contact with parents about schoolwork problems, I find that, in comparison to white boys (48%), first grade teachers contact a higher proportion of black (63%) and Latino (53%) boys' parents, and a lower proportion of Asian boys' parents (42%). These differences are significant at the $p < .001$ level. Lastly, for teacher contact with parents about accomplishments, I find that teachers contact a higher proportion of Asian boys' (42%) parents in comparison to white boys (32%). This difference is significant at the $p < .001$ level. Overall, these findings suggest that, in comparison to white boys, teachers are more likely to contact the parents of black boys for behavioral and academic problems. Also, teachers are more likely to contact the parents of Latino boys about academic problems. In contrast, teachers are less likely to contact the parents of Asian boys about behavior problems and more likely to contact them about accomplishments as compared to white boys.

(Table 5.2 about here.)

Multivariate Regression Analyses of Teachers Contacting Boys' Parents

Descriptive results suggest that teachers contact the parents of racial/ethnic minority boys differently than the parents of white boys. More specifically, a higher proportion of black parents are contacted about behavioral and academic problems, a higher proportion of Latino parents are contacted about academic problems, and a lower proportion of Asian parents are contacted about behavior problems, while a higher proportion of Asian parents are contacted about accomplishments. While these descriptive results are useful for looking at overall patterns, these differences may be shaped by student, teacher, and school characteristics. To consider the characteristics that affect racial differences in teacher contact with boys' parents, I use regression analysis. Table 3 presents odds ratios from logistic regression models estimating first grade teachers' reported contact with parents. Again, three outcomes are analyzed: teacher contact about (1) behavior problems, (2) schoolwork problems, and (3) accomplishments. For each outcome, the first model specification includes only dummy variables for racial/ethnic classification. The second model includes student test scores, age, and socioeconomic status. The third model adds teacher and school characteristics. The fourth, and final, model adds the primary variable of interest, teacher-rated problem behavior.

(Table 5.3 about here.)

Results from my analyses testing the odds of teacher contact with boys' parents about behavior problems demonstrate that teachers are about two times more likely to contact the parents of black boys as compared to white boys. Also, teachers are 1.5 times more likely to contact the parents of white boys in comparison to Asian boys.

After controlling for student characteristics, the disparity between white and Asian boys is reduced to non-significance. However, the disparity between black and white boys remain significant as teachers are 1.5 times more likely to contact the parents of black boys about behavior problems. In model 2, I also find that teachers are now 1.4 times more likely to contact the parents of white boys as compared to Latino boys about behavior problems. Model 3 adds teacher and school characteristics. Similar to the previous model, in comparison to white boys, I find that teachers are more likely to contact black boys' parents and less likely to contact Latino boys' parents about behavior problems. In the final model estimating teacher contact with parents for behavior problems, I add a variable that measures teacher-rated problem behavior. As expected, this variable is the strongest predictor of teacher contact with parents about behavior problems. Adding the problem behavior variable reduces the disparity between white and Latino boys to non-significance. However, the disparity between black and white boys remains. Overall, findings from logistic regression analyses of teacher contact with parents about behavior problems suggest reveal that teachers are more likely to contact the parents of black boys about behavior problems, even amongst boys who exhibit similar levels of problem behaviors.

Results from models predicting teacher contact with parents about schoolwork problems demonstrate that teachers are more likely to contact the parents of black and Latino boys about academic problems. However, in the second model, controlling for student test scores and age reduce these disparities to non-significance. Thus, this suggests that the previous disparities may be due to differences in test scores and age

amongst black, Latino, and white boys. Interestingly, in the third model I find that teachers are now less likely to contact the parents of Latino and Asian boys about academic problems. These findings suggest that there is something about the racial/ethnic makeup of the teachers and the proportion of low-income students in the school that shapes teacher contact, or lack thereof, with Asian and Latino boys' parents about academic problems. These findings remain consistent in the fourth model.

The final set of analyses predicts teacher contact with boys' parents about accomplishments. In the first model, I find that teachers are 1.5 more likely to contact the parents of Asian boys about accomplishments in comparison to white boys' parents. The second model, which adds student characteristics, teachers continue to be more likely to contact Asian boys' parents about accomplishments, while they are less likely to contact the parents of black boys. Controlling for teacher and school characteristics in model 3 reduces the disparity between black and white boys to non-significance. This finding suggests that the reason that teachers are less likely to contact the parents of black boys about accomplishments is related to the socioeconomic makeup of the schools they attend. However, the disparity between Asian and white boys is widened as teachers are now 1.8 times more likely to contact the parents of Asian boys about accomplishments. In model 4, this disparity is widened even more as teachers are 1.9 times more likely to contact the parents of Asian boys as compared to white boys. Overall, my findings demonstrate that teachers advantage Asian boys in terms of their contact with parents about accomplishments, holding student, teacher, and school characteristics constant.

Predicted Rates of Teacher Contact with Boys' Parents about Behavior Problems

As teacher contact with parents about behavior problems is of utmost relevance to understanding the relationship between racial meanings and school discipline, I present a more intuitive account of rates of first grade teachers' contact with young boys' parents about behavior problems. In Table 4, I show predicted rates of teacher contact with the parents of the black and white boys about behavior problems at each level of teacher-rated problem behavior. Please note that these predicted rates (percentages) hold the control variables in the previous logistic regression analyses at their means. The findings demonstrate that, as compared to white boys, teachers contact a higher percentage of black boys' parents at each level of problem behavior (i.e., rarely, sometimes, often, and very often). Thus, regardless of the amount of problem behavior that the teacher perceives that black boys exhibit in the classroom, they are more likely to contact black boys parents rather than white boys' parents. However, interestingly the disparities between black and white boys are largest when teachers rate that black boys "rarely" or "sometimes" exhibit problem behaviors. For example, among boys who teachers rate as "rarely" exhibiting problem behavior, teachers contacted 29% of black boys' parents and 22% of white boys' parents. Also, among boys who "sometimes" exhibit problem behavior, teachers contacted 70% of black boys' parents and 62% of white boys' parents. The findings from predicted rates suggest that teachers penalize black boys for problem behavior, regardless of how often they exhibit problem behavior. However, this penalty is especially evident amongst black boys who exhibit few problem behaviors.

(Table 5.4 about here.)

DISCUSSION

Few studies have taken a teacher-initiated approach to understanding racial/ethnic inequalities in parental involvement in education. The goal of this chapter is to investigate how teacher contact with parents about behavior problems, academic problems, and accomplishments may be shaped by racialized and gendered meanings. Teacher communication with parents about behavior problems is of particular interests as school discipline issues often relate to student defiance of teacher expectations, rather than academic performance. Still, looking at these three outcomes provides a broader sense of how racial biases uniquely affect teachers' contact with the parents of black boys in particular. I find that teachers are more likely to contact the parents of black boys about behavior problems, less likely to contact Asian and Latino parents about academic problems, and more likely to contact the parents of Asian boys about accomplishments. My findings suggest that biases against black boys are especially evident in teacher contact with parents about behavior problems. In contrast, while some bias appeared in teacher contact about academic or accomplishments, these disparities did not persist in the same way that my analyses for behavioral problems did. This suggests that the strength of the "controlling image" or depiction of black boys as deviants is evident in how teachers communicate with parents about behavioral problems rather than about academic concerns or accomplishments.

Findings from this study also demonstrate that teachers' contact with the parents of Asian boys mirror perceptions of the "model minority." This has two implications. First, it demonstrates that the "model minority" stereotype Asian boys may have both positive and negative implications for Asian boys' academic trajectories. If teachers are less likely to contact the parents of Asian boys about behavior and/or academic problems these problems may persist. On the other hand, if teachers are more likely to contact Asian boys' parents about accomplishments this may have positive effects on the parent-child relationship as well as future academic performance. Taken together, the lack of contact with Asian parents about problems and more contact about successes may be a "double-edged sword." Second, these findings also speak to racial triangulation theory (Kim 1999). As race is a social relationship, the finding that teacher contact with the parents of Asian boys reflects the model minority stereotype is interrelated with my findings that teacher contact with the parents of black boys reflects the deviant criminal stereotype. That is, the valorization of Asian Americans more broadly in U.S. society through the model minority stereotype is in relation to the demonization of African Americans.

My findings may speak to larger depictions of black masculinity as deviant and uncontrollable (Collins 2005a). Teachers are more likely to contact the parents of black boys because they might perceive that their behaviors are unlikely to be remedied by teachers or other school personnel. Perhaps teachers feel that black boys are too much of a problem for them in classroom and difficult to control. Thus, they may contact the parents of black boys out of a feeling of the loss of control. Secondly, it is also possible

that this finding is also related to the demonization of black families, and more specifically, black motherhood (Collins 2005b; Roberts 1999, 1997). Racist cultural ideologies suggest that the failings of black boys in schools are due to the absence of black fathers and the failures of black mothers. However, my analyses suggest that racial biases are the source of this problem rather than black boys', or their parents', behaviors.

CHAPTER 6:

DISCUSSION

Teachers' perceptions of boys' behavior, disciplinary interactions with their male students, and communication with parents about behavior problems are not merely based on the behavior of the students. My dissertation suggests that these perceptions and interactions are indeed racialized in early childhood. In my analyses, I use data from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Kindergarten Class of 2010, a panel study of U.S. kindergartners. I also use data from ethnographic observations in a diverse elementary school. Overall, I find that teachers are more likely to perceive and interact with black boys in early childhood in ways that mirror and reinforce the racialized depiction of them as problems. That is, given similar behavior as non-black boys, teachers view black boys' behavior more negatively and treat them more harshly than non-black boys.

The dissertation begins with an analysis of teacher perceptions of boys' problem behavior and student-teacher conflict in kindergarten. I find that teachers rate that black boys' exhibit more problem behavior than non-black boys. This pattern holds even after controlling for past problem behavior, and other student, teacher, and school characteristics. I also find a similar pattern when looking at teacher perceptions of the amount of conflict they have with students. That is, net of control variables including past behavior, teachers rate having more negative interactions with black boys in comparison to non-black boys. Therefore, the findings from this chapter suggest that

teachers view young black boys and their behaviors through a racialized lens even as they behave similarly to other boys.

Using ethnographic observations, the dissertation then proceeds to examine teachers' routine disciplinary interactions with black and white boys. Here I find that teachers take a racialized approach to discipline. Comparing black and white boys who defy teacher behavioral expectations, teachers take an authoritarian approach to discipline with black boys and a permissive approach to discipline with white boys. These racialized approaches to discipline led to unequal disciplinary outcomes for black and white boys. Findings from this chapter indicate that the ways that teachers interact with "misbehaving" black boys and white boys is qualitatively different. Building upon the first empirical chapter, this suggests that not only do teachers perceptions of black boys mirror the dominant depictions of black masculinity and reinforce their marginalized status, their disciplinary interactions with them also appear to reflect these perceptions.

The final empirical chapter continues to further understand the implications of teachers' racialized perceptions and interactions with young boys by investigating the link between boys' problem behavior and teacher communication with parents about behavior problems. Overall, the findings show that, in comparison to similarly behaving non-black boys, teachers are more likely to contact the parents of black boys about behavior problems. Thus, building upon the first and second empirical chapters, teachers racialized perceptions and interactions with boys affect their frequency of communication with parents about behavior issues. Overall, these patterns suggest that

racialized depictions of black masculinity do indeed shape the earliest school experiences of black boys. This is in contrast to previous work that argues that these stereotypes do not affect black boys' social experiences until around 10 years old or fourth grade (Goff et al. 2014; Kunjufu 1995; Ladson-Billings 2011)(Goff et al. 2014; Kunjufu 1995; Ladson-Billings 2011). The power of racialized and gendered meanings is evident as early as when children first come into contact with schools, likely their first contact with a formal institution outside of the family.

Social reproduction, anti-blackness, and schooling

This dissertation aimed to merge theories of social reproduction in education and African-centered theories of schooling to analyze the role of schools as a racializing institution. Sociologists of education who study black children should become familiar with African-centered theories of education to put black children's school experiences and outcomes into their proper context. While sociologists of education have done a satisfactory job documenting the challenges and inequalities that black children face, African-centered scholars theorize why these experiences and outcomes exist for black children and youth.

In this dissertation, I examine the ways in which schooling racializes young children, reproducing racial and gender stratification. I do so by investigating teacher racial biases in their views and relations with their young students. These biases, whether unconscious or not, are not simply errors of judgment that individual teachers may act upon. The teachers in the ethnographic portion of the study, likely like many

teachers across the United States, were often well-meaning and wanted the best for their students. Rather, as African-centered theories of schooling suggest, these biases are embedded within the larger sociopolitical context of anti-black racism and white supremacy. Thus, teacher racial bias has little to do with individual teachers' motivations and personal choices but reflect a larger educational system and society that seeks to maintain white supremacy and black subjugation. In such a context, children are socialized through their interactions with teachers, for example, into styles of social relations in which they learn what it means to be black. This is similar to how working-class youth are socialized into working-class jobs (Willis 1981). However, the socialization of black children and youth is distinct as discipline and punitive control characterize their socialization. This reflects the larger society's concern with the policing and control of black people. In essence, the social relations that black boys experience in schools in early childhood are preparing them for a future of criminalization. I agree with Kunjufu (1995) that this criminalization does not begin in adulthood when black males are disproportionately incarcerated. However, from my study it is also clear that it does not begin in fourth grade when some black boys may begin to disassociate from schooling.

Black boyhood and schooling before overt criminalization

Although the findings of this dissertation suggest that black boys' relations with their teachers construct them as uniquely deviant, by studying younger boys my findings enhance current conceptualizations of the criminalization of blackness. Scholars

typically conceptualize the criminalization of blackness as anti-black racial ideology that posits that there is a link between black people and criminality. The criminalization of black males in particular was related to the historical shift in the racialized depiction of black males as the “brute” to the more contemporary depiction of the black male “thug” (Smiley and Fakunle 2016). In short, black males are characterized as dangerous with inherently criminal tendencies. The contemporary depiction is frequently deployed to justify various forms of anti-black racism including mass incarceration and even police murder. The findings of this dissertation point to a subtler but nonetheless powerful form of anti-black racism in early childhood. In addition to these more overt forms of racism, the literature on anti-black racism and schooling should also consider the covert and mundane ways that racism affects the lives of black children and youth such as biases in teacher perceptions and racialized interactions. This is particularly important when investigating the school experiences of young children. Perhaps the focus on overt racial prejudice and discrimination is why previous work on black boys and education makes an error when arguing that the criminalization of black boys does not occur until around age 10 or fourth grade (e.g., Kunjufu 1995; Ladson-Billings 2011)(Kunjufu 1995; Ladson-Billings 2011).

Age and the salience of racial and gendered meanings

Finally, the contribution of my dissertation speaks to the salience of racial and gendered meanings and the importance of taking age into account. Few sociologists consider how age may shape the ways in which racial ideologies are enacted. For

example, one would not expect that teachers would view and treat a high school aged black boy the same as a kindergartener. Yet from the prevailing literature there is no sense how these relations may be similar or differ. Nevertheless, as my dissertation suggests, these social meanings are still powerful for shaping human perception and interaction. Future literature in the sociology of race, racism, and intersectionality should examine how age structures processes of racialization and discrimination, for example.

Future directions of research

There are several natural extensions of this research. Although the ethnographic part of this dissertation demonstrates how children respond to disciplinary interactions, more attention could be paid to the varying ways that children react in these situations. In addition, there is also a need for children's own perspectives on their behavior and their disciplinary interactions with teachers. For example, how do they feel when they are disciplined? Do they feel that they are being treated fairly or unfairly? Do they feel that they are powerless or that they have some say in their education? Prior research highlights the importance of children's agency in social reproduction (Calarco 2011, 2014; Hagerman 2016). Still, there is a need for research that closely examines race, school discipline, and children's agency. Without such scholarship the literature remains somewhat overly deterministic.

Prior research points to age 10 or fourth grade as a critical period where teachers views of black boys shift as they become bigger and often taller than their

teachers. Yet there are no longitudinal studies of black boys that look at how teacher perceptions and interactions with them change over time. Such a study will be useful for identifying key transition periods. It will also be useful for understanding how black boys' behaviors and teachers' responses may or may not change over time.

The third empirical chapter also brings additional questions. Mainly, how do parents respond to teacher contact with them about behavior problems? Are black parents' responses different from those of white parents' responses? How do parents understand their child's behavior? Do parents internalize and/or resist the messages they get from the school about their children? Also, it would be interesting to study the convergences and divergences between discipline at home and at school. It is likely that disciplinary problems at school may affect discipline at home, and vice versa.

Finally, the results of this dissertation point to the need for the study of black girls' school experiences in early childhood. There has been some research in this regard (Epstein, Blake, and González 2017; Morris 2016; Zimmermann 2018) but more is needed. A recent surge of research on the school experiences of black girls has emerged but most studies look at adolescents (Haynes, Stewart, and Allen 2016; Morris and Perry 2017; Slate, Gray, and Jones 2016; Wun 2016). In order to have a complete understanding of blackness and schooling, scholars must not erase the unique experiences of black girls. One of the main criticisms of the push for increased representation of black girls in educational research is that school discipline interventions and policies for black girls were often based on research about black boys

(Crenshaw, Ocen, and Nanda 2015; Patton et al. 2016). This ignores the specific challenges that black girls face in schools and results in inadequate policies.

APPENDIX:

TABLES

Table 3.1. Metric, Means, and Standard Deviations for Variables Used in the Analysis: ECLS-K, 2010-2011

Variable	Metric	Mean	SD
<i>Dependent Variables (Spring 2011)</i>			
Externalizing problem behaviors	1 to 4	1.64	0.64
Student-teacher conflict	1 to 5	1.64	0.80
<i>Independent/Control Variables (Fall 2010)</i>			
Student race and gender	0 = White boy, 1 = White girl, 2 = Black boy, 3 = Black girl, 4 = Latino boy, 5 = Latino girl, 6 = Asian boy, 7 = Asian girl	--	--
Student age	In Months	68.42	4.23
First-time kindergartner	0 = No, 1 = Yes	0.95	0.21
Socioeconomic status	-2.33 to 2.6	-0.05	0.76
Externalizing problem behaviors	1 = low to 4 = high	1.60	0.56
Math assessment score	5.33 to 74.91	29.28	10.00
Reading assessment score	6.24 to 82.58	34.63	10.97
Non-white teacher	0 = No, 1 = Yes	0.19	0.40
Teacher experience	In Years	14.50	8.95
Teacher highest education level	2 = High School to 7 = Advanced/Professional Degree	5.38	0.55
Public school	0 = No, 1 = Yes	0.88	0.32
Percentage of non-white students	0-100	49.00	33.88
Percentage eligible for free lunch	0-100	43.27	31.14

School region	0 = Northeast, 1 = Midwest, 2 = South, 3 = West	--	--
School locale	0 = City, 1 = Suburb, 2 = Town, 3 = Rural	--	--

Table 3.2. Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon Test for Differences in Weighted Means on Teacher-Rated Problem Behaviors and Student-Teacher Conflict by Student Race and Gender

Problems Behaviors				Student-Teacher Conflict		
<i>Girls</i>	Mean	SD	Sig.	Mean	SD	Sig.
Black girls	1.69	0.66	**	1.71	0.85	n.s.
White girls	1.48	0.55	***	1.46	0.69	***
Latino girls	1.49	0.53	***	1.47	0.66	***
Asian girls	1.36	0.43	***	1.38	0.54	***
<i>Boys</i>						
Black boys	2.01	0.80	***	2.05	1.03	***
White boys	1.75	0.66	--	1.74	0.86	--
Latino boys	1.71	0.66	n.s.	1.71	0.79	n.s.
Asian boys	1.62	0.55	***	1.63	0.71	n.s.

Note: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$; n.s. = not significant

Table 3.3. OLS Regression Models Predicting Teachers' Perceptions of Children's Problem Behaviors, by Student Race and Gender

Variable	Model 1	Model 2
<i>Race-gender</i>		
White boys	--	--
White girls	-0.25*** (0.02)	-0.06*** (0.02)
Black boys	0.18*** (0.04)	0.10** (0.03)
Black girls	-0.13*** (0.03)	-0.01 (0.03)
Latino boys	-0.15*** (0.03)	-0.06* (0.06)
Latino girls	-0.40*** (0.03)	-0.14*** (0.02)
Asian boys	-0.04 (0.05)	0.01 (0.04)
Asian girls	-0.34*** (0.05)	-0.10** (0.03)
<i>Past behavior</i>		
Past problem behaviors		0.71*** (0.01)
Constant	2.31*** (0.18)	0.82*** (0.13)
R^2	0.09	0.51
N	12,854	12,854

Note: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$; Model 1 controls not shown for space and presentation considerations. Model 1 includes controls for age, first time kindergartener, socioeconomic status, test scores, teacher race, teacher education level, teacher experience, the percentage of nonwhite students in the school, the percentage of students eligible for free lunch in the school, whether the school is public school, school region, and school locale. Model 2 adds teachers' ratings of student problem behavior in the fall of kindergarten.

Table 3.4. OLS Regression Models Predicting Teachers' Perceptions of Student-Teacher Conflict, by Student Race and Gender

Variable	Model 1	Model 2
<i>Race-gender</i>		
White boys	--	--
White girls	-0.27*** (0.02)	-0.07*** (0.02)
Black boys	0.19*** (0.05)	0.10* (0.04)
Black girls	-0.13** (0.05)	0.01 (0.04)
Latino boys	-0.21*** (0.03)	-0.11*** (0.03)
Latino girls	-0.43*** (0.03)	-0.15*** (0.03)
Asian boys	0.09 (0.06)	-0.04 (0.05)
Asian girls	-0.36*** (0.05)	-0.10** (0.03)
<i>Past behavior</i>		
Past problem behaviors		0.75*** (0.02)
Constant	2.18*** (0.22)	0.62*** (0.17)
R^2	0.07	0.37
N	12,905	12,905

Note: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$; Model 1 controls not shown for space considerations. Model 1 includes controls for age, first time kindergartener, family structure, socioeconomic status, test scores, teacher education level, teacher experience, the percentage of nonwhite students in the school, the percentage of students eligible for free lunch in the school, and whether the school is public school. Model 2 adds teachers' ratings of student problem behavior in the fall of kindergarten.

Table 5.1. Metric, Means, and Standard Deviations for Variables Used in the Analysis: ECLS-K, 2010-2011

Variable	Metric	Mean	SD
<i>Dependent Variables</i>			
Contact about Behavior Problems	0 = No, 1 = Yes	0.38	0.49
Contact about Academic Problems	0 = No, 1 = Yes	0.48	0.5
Contact about Achievements	0 = No, 1 = Yes	0.32	0.47
<i>Independent/Control Variables</i>			
Boys by race/ethnicity	0 = White boy, 1 = Black boy, 2 = Latino boy, 3 = Asian boy	--	--
Student age	In Months	68.42	4.23
First-time kindergartner	0 = No, 1 = Yes	0.95	0.21
Socioeconomic status	-2.33 to 2.6	-0.05	0.76
Externalizing problem behaviors	1 = low to 4 = high	1.6	0.56
Math assessment score	5.33 to 74.91	29.28	10
Reading assessment score	6.24 to 82.58	34.63	10.97
Non-white teacher	0 = No, 1 = Yes	0.19	0.4
Teacher experience	In Years	14.5	8.95
Percentage of non-white students	0-100	49	33.88
Percentage eligible for free lunch	0-100	43.27	31.14

Table 5.2. Proportion of Parents of Boys Contacted by First Grade Teacher, by Race/Ethnicity

	Behavior Problems		Academic Problems		Accomplishments	
White	0.47	ref.	0.48	ref.	0.32	ref.
Black	0.63	***	0.63	***	0.31	
Latino	0.46		0.53	***	0.3	
Asian	0.36	***	0.42	***	0.42	***

*** p < .001, ** p<.01, * p<.05

Table 5.3. Odds Ratios from Logistic Regression Models Estimating First Grade Teacher Reports of Contacting Boys' Parents, by Race/Ethnicity

	Behavioral Problems				School Work Problems				Doing Well			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
White	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Black	1.97***	1.5***	1.46***	1.46***	1.87**	1.25	1.03	0.99	0.95	0.73***	1.01	1.1
Latino	0.99	0.72***	0.68**	0.79	1.25*	0.81	0.75***	0.78**	0.93	0.85	1.06	1.06
Asian	0.65**	0.75	0.77	0.87	0.79	0.91	0.74**	0.74*	1.51*	1.56*	1.8**	1.92**
Reading Test Score		0.99*	0.99**	1		0.96***	0.95***	0.96***		1	1	1
Math Test Score		1.00	1	1.01		0.95***	0.95***	0.96***		0.98***	0.97***	0.97***
Age		1.00	1	1		1.02*	1.02***	1.02**		1.02	1.02	1.02
SES		0.67***	0.66***	0.67***		0.99	0.94	0.94		1.02	0.91*	0.93
Teaching Experience			1.00	1.01*			0.99	0.99			1	0.99*
Teacher Non-White			0.86*	0.86**			1.66***	1.78***			0.88	0.89
School % Non-White			1.00	1			1	1			1	1
School % Eligible for Free/Reduced Lunch			1.00	1			0.99**	0.99*			0.99**	0.99**
Problem Behavior				5.96***				1.42***				0.93
Observations	3,928	3,928	3,928	3,928	3,926	3,926	3,926	3,926	3,925	3,925	3,925	3,925

***p < .001, **p < .01, *p < .05

Table 5.4. Predicted Rates of Teacher Contact with the Parents of Black and White Boys about Behavioral Problems

	Teacher-Rated Problem Behavior			
	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very Often
Black boys	0.29	0.7	0.93	0.99
White boys	0.22	0.62	0.91	0.98

Please note that the control variables are held at their means.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, Karl, Doris Entwisle, and Linda Olson. 2014. *The Long Shadow: Family Background, Disadvantaged Urban Youth, and the Transition to Adulthood*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Anyon, Jean. 1980. "Social Class and the Hidden Curriculum of Work." *The Journal of Education* 162(1):67–92.
- Bashi, Vilna. 2004. "Globalized Anti-Blackness: Transnationalizing Western Immigration Law, Policy, and Practice." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 27(4):584–606.
- Bidwell, Charles E. and John D. Kasarda. 1980. "Conceptualizing and Measuring the Effects of School and Schooling." *American Journal of Education* 88(4):401–30.
- Blau, Peter M. and Otis Dudley Duncan. 1967. *The American Occupational Structure*. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2015. "More than Prejudice Restatement, Reflections, and New Directions in Critical Race Theory." *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 1(1):73–87.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2013. *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in America*. Fourth Edition edition. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Jean-Claude Passeron. 1990. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture, 2nd Edition*. 2nd edition. London ; Newbury Park, Calif: Sage Publications.
- Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis. 2011. *Schooling In Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life*. Chicago, Ill.: Haymarket Books.

- Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis. 2003. "Schooling in Capitalist America Twenty-Five Years Later." *Sociological Forum* 18(2):343–48.
- Brown, Anthony L. and Jamel K. Donnor. 2011. "Toward a New Narrative on Black Males, Education, and Public Policy." *Race Ethnicity and Education* 14(1):17–32.
- Buchmann, Claudia, Thomas A. DiPrete, and Anne McDaniel. 2008. "Gender Inequalities in Education." *Annual Review of Sociology* 34(1):319–37.
- Buyse, Evelien, Karine Verschueren, Sarah Doumen, Jan Van Damme, and Frederik Maes. 2008. "Classroom Problem Behavior and Teacher-Child Relationships in Kindergarten: The Moderating Role of Classroom Climate." *Journal of School Psychology* 46(4):367–91.
- Byng, Michelle D. 2013. "You Can't Get There from Here: A Social Process Theory of Racism and Race." *Critical Sociology* 39(5):705–15.
- Calarco, Jessica McCrory. 2014. "Coached for the Classroom Parents' Cultural Transmission and Children's Reproduction of Educational Inequalities." *American Sociological Review* 79(5):1015–37.
- Calarco, Jessica McCrory. 2011. "'I Need Help!' Social Class and Children's Help-Seeking in Elementary School." *American Sociological Review* 3122411427177.
- Carter, Prudence L. 2012. *Stubborn Roots: Race, Culture, and Inequality in U.S. and South African Schools*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Cherng, Hua-Yu Sebastian. 2016. "Is All Classroom Conduct Equal?: Teacher Contact with Parents of Racial/Ethnic Minority and Immigrant Adolescents." *Teachers College Record* 118(11).

- Collins, Patricia Hill. 2006. "A Telling Difference: Dominance, Strength, and Black Masculinities." Pp. 73–96 in *Progressive Black Masculinities*. Edited by Athena D. Mutua: Routledge.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 2000. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 2005a. *Black Sexual Politics: African Americans, Gender, and the New Racism*. New Ed edition. New York; London: Routledge.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 2005b. "Black Women and Motherhood." Pp. 149–59 in *Motherhood and Space: Configurations of the Maternal through Politics, Home, and the Body*, edited by S. Hardy and C. Wiedmer. Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Collins, Randall. 1971. "Functional and Conflict Theories of Educational Stratification." *American Sociological Review* 36(6):1002–19.
- Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1991. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review* 43(6):1241–99.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé, Priscilla Ocen, and Jyoti Nanda. 2015. *Black Girls Matter: Pushed Out, Overpoliced and Underprotected*. New York, NY: Center for Intersectionality and Social Policy Studies.
- Crosnoe, Robert et al. 2010. "Instruction, Teacher–student Relations, and Math Achievement Trajectories in Elementary School." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 102(2):407.
- De Lissovoy, Noah. 2012. "Education and Violation: Conceptualizing Power, Domination,

- and Agency in the Hidden Curriculum.” *Race Ethnicity and Education* 15(4):463–84.
- Decker, Dawn M., Daria Paul Dona, and Sandra L. Christenson. 2007. “Behaviorally at-Risk African American students:The Importance of Student–teacher Relationships for Student Outcomes.” *Journal of School Psychology* 45(1):83–109.
- Diamond, John B. 2006. “Still Separate and Unequal: Examining Race, Opportunity, and School Achievement in ‘Integrated’ Suburbs.” *The Journal of Negro Education* 75(3):495–505.
- DiPrete, Thomas A. and Claudia Buchmann. 2013. *The Rise of Women: The Growing Gender Gap in Education and What It Means for American Schools*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- DiPrete, Thomas A. and Jennifer L. Jennings. 2012. “Social and Behavioral Skills and the Gender Gap in Early Educational Achievement.” *Social Science Research* 41(1):1–15.
- Dotterer, Aryn M. and Elizabeth Wehrspann. 2016. “Parent Involvement and Academic Outcomes among Urban Adolescents: Examining the Role of School Engagement.” *Educational Psychology* 36(4):812–30.
- Downey, Douglas B. and Shana Pribesh. 2004. “When Race Matters: Teachers’ Evaluations of Students’ Classroom Behavior.” *Sociology of Education* 77(4):267–282.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. 1935. “Does the Negro Need Separate Schools?” *The Journal of Negro*

- Education* 4(3):328–35.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. 1898. “The Study of the Negro Problems.” *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 11(1):1–23.
- Dumas, Michael J. 2016a. “Against the Dark: Antiblackness in Education Policy and Discourse.” *Theory Into Practice* 55(1):11–19.
- Dumas, Michael J. 2014. “‘Losing an Arm’: Schooling as a Site of Black Suffering.” *Race Ethnicity and Education* 17(1):1–29.
- Dumas, Michael J. 2016b. “My Brother as ‘Problem’: Neoliberal Governmentality and Interventions for Black Young Men and Boys.” *Educational Policy* 30(1):94–113.
- Dumas, Michael J. and Joseph Derrick Nelson. 2016. “(Re)Imagining Black Boyhood: Toward a Critical Framework for Educational Research.” *Harvard Educational Review* 86(1):27–47.
- El Nokali, Nermeen E., Bachman, Heather J., and Votruba-Drzal, Elizabeth. 2010. “Parent Involvement and Children’s Academic and Social Development in Elementary School.” *Child Development* 81(3):988–1005.
- Emerson, Robert M., Rachel I. Fretz, and Linda L. Shaw. 2011. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes, Second Edition*. 2 edition. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.
- Epstein, Rebecca, Jamilia J. Blake, and Thalia González. 2017. *Girlhood Interrupted: The Erasure of Black Girls’ Childhood*. Center on Poverty and Inequality: Georgetown Law.
- Fan, Xitao and Michael Chen. 2001. “Parental Involvement and Students’ Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis.” *Educational Psychology Review* 13(1):1–22.

- Farkas, George. 2003. "Cognitive Skills and Noncognitive Traits and Behaviors in Stratification Processes." *Annual Review of Sociology* 541–562.
- Faulkner, Valerie N., Lee V. Stiff, Patricia L. Marshall, John Nietfeld, and Cathy L. Crossland. 2014. "Race and Teacher Evaluations as Predictors of Algebra Placement." *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education* 45(3):288–311.
- Feagin, Joe R. 2014. *Racist America: Roots, Current Realities, and Future Reparations*. 3 edition. New York: Routledge.
- Ferber, Abby L. 2007. "The Construction of Black Masculinity White Supremacy Now and Then." *Journal of Sport & Social Issues* 31(1):11–24.
- Ferguson, Ann Arnett. 2001. *Bad Boys: Public Schools in the Making of Black Masculinity*. University of Michigan Press.
- Ferguson, Ronald F. 2003. "Teachers' Perceptions and Expectations and the Black-White Test Score Gap." *Urban Education* 38(4):460–507.
- Francis, Dania V. 2012. "Sugar and Spice and Everything Nice? Teacher Perceptions of Black Girls in the Classroom." *The Review of Black Political Economy* 39(3):311–20.
- Gilliam, Walter S., Angela N. Maupin, Chin R. Reyes, Maria Accavitti, and Frederick Shic. 2016. "Do Early Educators' Implicit Biases Regarding Sex and Race Relate to Behavior Expectations and Recommendations of Preschool Expulsions and Suspensions?" *Yale Child Study Center, September* 991–1013.
- Giroux, Henry A. and Anthony N. Penna. 1979. "Social Education in the Classroom: The Dynamics of the Hidden Curriculum." *Theory & Research in Social Education*

7(1):21–42.

Givens, Jarvis Ray. 2016. “A Grammar for Black Education beyond Borders: Exploring Technologies of Schooling in the African Diaspora.” *Race Ethnicity and Education* 19(6):1288–1302.

Glaser, Barney and Anselm Strauss. 2000. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. New Brunswick: Routledge.

Goff, Phillip Atiba, Matthew Christian Jackson, Brooke Allison Lewis Di Leone, Carmen Marie Culotta, and Natalie Ann DiTomasso. 2014. “The Essence of Innocence: Consequences of Dehumanizing Black Children.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 106(4):526–45.

Golash-Boza, Tanya. 2016. “A Critical and Comprehensive Sociological Theory of Race and Racism.” *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 2(2):129–41.

Gordon, Lewis R. 1995. *Bad Faith and Antiracist Racism*. Prometheus Books.

Gregory, Anne, Russell J. Skiba, and Pedro A. Noguera. 2010. “The Achievement Gap and the Discipline Gap Two Sides of the Same Coin?” *Educational Researcher* 39(1):59–68.

Hagerman, Margaret Ann. 2016. “Reproducing and Reworking Colorblind Racial Ideology Acknowledging Children’s Agency in the White Habitus.” *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 2(1):58–71.

Hamre, Bridget K. and Robert C. Pianta. 2001. “Early Teacher–Child Relationships and the Trajectory of Children’s School Outcomes through Eighth Grade.” *Child Development* 72(2):625–38.

- Hamre, Bridget K., Robert C. Pianta, Jason T. Downer, and Andrew J. Mashburn. 2008. "Teachers' Perceptions of Conflict with Young Students: Looking beyond Problem Behaviors." *Social Development* 17(1):115–36.
- Hartman, Saidiya. 2007. *Lose Your Mother: A Journey Along the Atlantic Slave Route*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Hatt, Beth. 2011. "Smartness as a Cultural Practice in Schools." *American Educational Research Journal* 2831211415661.
- Haynes, Chayla, Saran Stewart, and Evette Allen. 2016. "Three Paths, One Struggle: Black Women and Girls Battling Invisibility in U.S. Classrooms." *The Journal of Negro Education* 85(3):380–91.
- Herrnstein, Richard J. 1973. *IQ in the Meritocracy*. Boston: Little-Brown.
- Herrnstein, Richard J. and Charles Murray. 1996. *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*. New York: Free Press.
- Hill, Marc Lamont. 2016. *Nobody: Casualties of America's War on the Vulnerable, from Ferguson to Flint and Beyond*. New York: Atria Books.
- Hill, Nancy E. and Diana F. Tyson. 2009. "Parental Involvement in Middle School: A Meta-Analytic Assessment of the Strategies That Promote Achievement." *Developmental Psychology* 45(3):740–63.
- Hilliard, Asa G. 1992. "Behavioral Style, Culture, and Teaching and Learning." *The Journal of Negro Education* 61(3):370–77.
- Hughes, Jan N. 2011. "Longitudinal Effects of Teacher and Student Perceptions of Teacher-Student Relationship Qualities on Academic Adjustment." *The*

Elementary School Journal 112(1):38.

Hughes, Jan N. and Oi-Man Kwok. 2007. "Influence of Student-Teacher and Parent-Teacher Relationships on Lower Achieving Readers' Engagement and Achievement in the Primary Grades." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 99(1):39–51.

Irizarry, Yasmiyn. 2015a. "Selling Students Short: Racial Differences in Teachers' Evaluations of High, Average, and Low Performing Students." *Social Science Research* 52:522–38.

Irizarry, Yasmiyn. 2015b. "Utilizing Multidimensional Measures of Race in Education Research The Case of Teacher Perceptions." *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 1(4):564–83.

Jencks, Christopher. 1972. *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America*. New York: Basic Books.

Jeynes, William H. 2007. "The Relationship Between Parental Involvement and Urban Secondary School Student Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis." *Urban Education* 42(1):82–110.

Kao, Grace and Jennifer Thompson. 2003. "Racial and Ethnic Stratification in Educational Achievement and Attainment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29:417–442.

Kesner, John E. 2000. "Teacher Characteristics and the Quality of Child–Teacher Relationships." *Journal of School Psychology* 38(2):133–49.

Kim, Claire Jean. 1999. "The Racial Triangulation of Asian Americans." *Politics & Society* 27(1):105–38.

- Kunjufu, Jawanza. 1995. *Countering the Conspiracy to Destroy Black Boys*. Chicago, IL: African American Images.
- Ladson-Billings, Gloria. 2011. "Boyz to Men? Teaching to Restore Black Boys' Childhood." *Race Ethnicity and Education* 14(1):7–15.
- LeFevre, Ann L. and Terry V. Shaw. 2012. "Latino Parent Involvement and School Success: Longitudinal Effects of Formal and Informal Support." *Education and Urban Society* 44(6):707–23.
- Lei, Joy L. 2003. "(Un) Necessary Toughness?: Those' Loud Black Girls' and Those' Quiet Asian Boys.'" *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 34(2):158–181.
- Lewis, Amanda E. 2003. *Race in the Schoolyard: Negotiating the Color Line in Classrooms and Communities*. New Brunswick, N.J: Rutgers University Press.
- Lewis, Amanda E. and John B. Diamond. 2015. *Despite the Best Intentions: How Racial Inequality Thrives in Good Schools*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lewis, Amanda E., John B. Diamond, and Tyrone A. Forman. 2015. "Conundrums of Integration: Desegregation in the Context of Racialized Hierarchy." *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 1(1):22–36.
- Lewis-McCoy, R.L'Heureux. 2014. *Inequality in the Promised Land: Race, Resources, and Suburban Schooling*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- MacLeod, Jay. 2008. *Ain't No Makin' It: Aspirations and Attainment in a Low-Income Neighborhood*. 3rd edition. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Majors, Richard and Janet Mancini Billson. 1993. *Cool Pose : The Dilemmas of Black Manhood in America*. Reprint edition. New York: Touchstone.

- McGrady, Patrick B. and John R. Reynolds. 2013. "Racial Mismatch in the Classroom Beyond Black-White Differences." *Sociology of Education* 86(1):3–17.
- McKown, Clark and Rhona S. Weinstein. 2008. "Teacher Expectations, Classroom Context, and the Achievement Gap." *Journal of School Psychology* 46(3):235–61.
- Monroe, Carla R. 2005. "Why Are 'Bad Boys' Always Black? Causes of Disproportionality in School Discipline and Recommendations for Change." *Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas* 79(1):45–50.
- Morris, Edward W. 2007. "'Ladies' or 'loudies'? Perceptions and Experiences of Black Girls in Classrooms." *Youth & Society* 38(4):490–515.
- Morris, Edward W. 2005. "'Tuck in That Shirt!' Race, Class, Gender, and Discipline in an Urban School." *Sociological Perspectives* 48(1):25–48.
- Morris, Edward W. and Brea L. Perry. 2017. "Girls Behaving Badly? Race, Gender, and Subjective Evaluation in the Discipline of African American Girls." *Sociology of Education* 90(2):127–48.
- Morris, Edward W. and Brea L. Perry. 2016. "The Punishment Gap: School Suspension and Racial Disparities in Achievement." *Social Problems* 63(1):68–86.
- Morris, Monique W. 2016. *Pushout: The Criminalization of Black Girls in Schools*. New York: The New Press.
- Murray, Christopher and Kelly M. Murray. 2004. "Child Level Correlates of Teacher–student Relationships: An Examination of Demographic Characteristics, Academic Orientations, and Behavioral Orientations." *Psychology in the Schools* 41(7):751–62.

- Noguera, P. A. 2003. "The Trouble with Black Boys:: The Role and Influence of Environmental and Cultural Factors on the Academic Performance of African American Males." *Urban Education* 38(4):431–59.
- O'Connor, Erin. 2010. "Teacher–child Relationships as Dynamic Systems." *Journal of School Psychology* 48(3):187–218.
- Okonofua, Jason A. and Jennifer L. Eberhardt. 2015. "Two Strikes Race and the Disciplining of Young Students." *Psychological Science* 26(5):617–24.
- Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. 2014. *Racial Formation in the United States*. 3 edition. New York: Routledge.
- Patton, Lori D., Kimberlé Crenshaw, Chayla Haynes, and Terri N. Watson. 2016. "Why We Can't Wait: (Re)Examining the Opportunities and Challenges for Black Women and Girls in Education (Guest Editorial)." *The Journal of Negro Education* 85(3):194–98.
- Pianta, Robert C. 2001. *STRS: Student-Teacher Relationship Scale: Professional Manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Pierre, Jemima. 2012. *The Predicament of Blackness: Postcolonial Ghana and the Politics of Race*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pollock, Mica. 2009. *Colormute: Race Talk Dilemmas in an American School*. Princeton University Press.
- Qi, Cathy Huaqing and Ann P. Kaiser. 2003. "Behavior Problems of Preschool Children From Low-Income Families Review of the Literature." *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education* 23(4):188–216.

- Rabaka, Reiland. 2013. "W.E.B. Du Bois's Contributions to Critical Race Studies in Education." Pp. 69–87 in *Handbook of Critical Race Theory in Education*, edited by M. Lynn and A. D. Dixon. Routledge.
- Rabaka, Reiland. 2003. "W.E.B. Du Bois's Evolving Africana Philosophy Of Education." *Journal of Black Studies* 33(4):399–449.
- Ready, Douglas D. and David L. Wright. 2011. "Accuracy and Inaccuracy in Teachers' Perceptions of Young Children's Cognitive Abilities The Role of Child Background and Classroom Context." *American Educational Research Journal* 48(2):335–360.
- Richards, Bedelia Nicola. 2017. "Tracking and Racialization in Schools: The Experiences of Second-Generation West Indians in New York City." *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 3(1):126–40.
- Riegle-Crumb, Catherine. 2006. "The Path through Math: Course Sequences and Academic Performance at the Intersection of Race-Ethnicity and Gender." *American Journal of Education* 113(1):101–22.
- Riegle-Crumb, Catherine and Melissa Humphries. 2012. "Exploring Bias in Math Teachers' Perceptions of Students' Ability by Gender and Race/Ethnicity." *Gender & Society* 26(2):290–322.
- Rios, Victor M. 2011. *Punished: Policing the Lives of Black and Latino Boys*. New York: NYU Press.
- Roberts, Dorothy E. 1999. *Killing the Black Body: Race, Reproduction, and the Meaning of Liberty*. Vintage.
- Roberts, Dorothy E. 1997. "Unshackling Black Motherhood." *Michigan Law Review*

95(4):938–64.

Robinson, Keith and Harris, Angel L. 2013. “Racial and Social Class Differences in How Parents Respond to Inadequate Achievement: Consequences for Children’s Future Achievement.” *Social Science Quarterly* 94(5):1346–71.

Robinson, Keith and Angel L. Harris. 2014. *The Broken Compass: Parental Involvement with Children’s Education*. Harvard University Press.

Rocque, Michael. 2010. “Office Discipline and Student Behavior: Does Race Matter?” *American Journal of Education* 116(4):557–581.

Rong, Xue Lan. 1996. “Effects of Race and Gender on Teachers’ Perception of the Social Behavior of Elementary Students.” *Urban Education* 31(3):261–290.

Roorda, Debora L., Helma MY Koomen, Jantine L. Spilt, and Frans J. Oort. 2011. “The Influence of Affective Teacher–student Relationships on Students’ School Engagement and Achievement a Meta-Analytic Approach.” *Review of Educational Research* 81(4):493–529.

Rudd, Tom. 2014. *Racial Disproportionality in School Discipline: Implicit Bias Is Heavily Implicated*. Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity: The Ohio State University.

Saft, Elizabeth W. and Robert C. Pianta. 2001. “Teachers’ Perceptions of Their Relationships with Students: Effects of Child Age, Gender, and Ethnicity of Teachers and Children.” *School Psychology Quarterly* 16(2):125–41.

Sewell, Tony. 1997. *Black Masculinities and Schooling. How Black Boys Survive Modern Schooling*. England: Trentham Books Ltd.

- Sewell, William H., Archibald O. Haller, and Alejandro Portes. 1969. "The Educational and Early Occupational Attainment Process." *American Sociological Review* 34(1):82–92.
- Sexton, Jared. 2008. *Amalgamation Schemes: Antiblackness and the Critique of Multiracialism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Skiba, Russell J., Robert S. Michael, Abra Carroll Nardo, and Reece L. Peterson. 2002. "The Color of Discipline: Sources of Racial and Gender Disproportionality in School Punishment." *The Urban Review* 34(4):317–342.
- Skiba, Russell J. and Natasha T. Williams. 2014. *Are Black Kids Worse? Myths and Facts about Racial Differences in Behavior*. The Equity Project: Indiana University.
- Slate, John R., Pamela L. Gray, and Brandolyn Jones. 2016. "A Clear Lack of Equity in Disciplinary Consequences for Black Girls in Texas: A Statewide Examination." *The Journal of Negro Education* 85(3):250–60.
- Smiley, CalvinJohn and David Fakunle. 2016. "From 'brute' to 'thug:' The Demonization and Criminalization of Unarmed Black Male Victims in America." *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment* 26(3–4):350–66.
- Thorne, Barrie. 1993. *Gender Play: Girls and Boys in School*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
- Turney, Kristin and Grace Kao. 2009. "Barriers to School Involvement: Are Immigrant Parents Disadvantaged?" *The Journal of Educational Research* 102(4):257–71.
- Tyson, Karolyn. 2011. *Integration Interrupted: Tracking, Black Students, and Acting White after Brown*. Oxford University Press.

- Tyson, Karolyn. 2003. "Notes from the Back of the Room: Problems and Paradoxes in the Schooling of Young Black Students." *Sociology of Education* 76(4):326–43.
- U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights. 2014. *Civil Rights Data Collection: Data Snapshot: School Discipline*.
- Van Ausdale, Debra and Joe R. Feagin. 2001. *The First R: How Children Learn Race and Racism*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Vargas, João H.Costa. 2012. "Gendered Antiracism and the Impossible Brazilian Project: Emerging Critical Black Brazilian Studies." *Cultural Dynamics* 24(1):3–11.
- Wagner, Peter. 2012. "Incarceration Is Not an Equal Opportunity Punishment." *Prison Policy Initiative*.
- Wallace, John M., Sara Goodkind, Cynthia M. Wallace, and Jerald G. Bachman. 2008. "Racial, Ethnic, and Gender Differences in School Discipline among U.S. High School Students: 1991-2005." *The Negro Educational Review* 59(1–2):47–62.
- Washington, Valora. 1982. "Racial Differences in Teacher Perceptions of First and Fourth Grade Pupils on Selected Characteristics." *The Journal of Negro Education* 51(1):60.
- Watkins, William H., William Ayers, and Therese Quinn. 2001. *The White Architects of Black Education: Ideology and Power in America, 1865-1954*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Welsing, Frances Cress. 1991. *The Isis Papers: The Keys to the Colors*. Chicago, IL: Third World Press.
- Williams, Robert W. 2004. "W. E. B. Du Bois and the Socio-Political Structures of

- Education." *Negro Educational Review, The* 55(1):9–26.
- Willis, Paul. 1981. *Learning to Labor: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs*.
New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wilson, Amos N. 1992. *Awakening the Natural Genius of Black Children*. New York:
Afrikan World InfoSystems.
- Wilson, Amos N. 1978. *Developmental Psychology of the Black Child*. New York: Africana
Research Publications.
- Winant, Howard. 2002. *The World Is a Ghetto: Race and Democracy Since World War II*.
New York: Basic Books.
- Woodson, Carter Godwin. 1933. *The Mis-Education of the Negro*. Tribeca Books.
- Wright, John Paul, Mark Alden Morgan, Michelle A. Coyne, Kevin M. Beaver, and J. C.
Barnes. 2014. "Prior Problem Behavior Accounts for the Racial Gap in School
Suspensions." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 42(3):257–266.
- Wun, Connie. 2015. "Against Captivity Black Girls and School Discipline Policies in the
Afterlife of Slavery." *Educational Policy* 1–26.
- Wun, Connie. 2016. "Angered: Black and Non-Black Girls of Color at the Intersections of
Violence and School Discipline in the United States." *Race Ethnicity and
Education* 0(0):1–15.
- Wun, Connie. 2014. "Unaccounted Foundations: Black Girls, Anti-Black Racism, and
Punishment in Schools." *Critical Sociology* 896920514560444.
- Yates, Tuppett M. and Ana K. Marcelo. 2014. "Through Race-Colored Glasses:
Preschoolers' Pretend Play and Teachers' Ratings of Preschooler Adjustment."

Early Childhood Research Quarterly 29(1):1–11.

Zimmermann, Calvin Rashaad. 2018. "The Penalty of Being a Young Black Girl: Kindergarten Teachers' Perceptions of Children's Problem Behaviors and Student-Teacher Conflict by the Intersection of Race and Gender." *The Journal of Negro Education* 87(2).

Zuberi, Tukufu. 2001. *Thicker Than Blood: How Racial Statistics Lie*. University of Minnesota Press.

Zuberi, Tukufu, Amson Sibanda, and Eric Udjo, eds. 2005. *The Demography of South Africa*. Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe.